

# THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1895.

---

## I.

### THE NEWLY-FOUND SYRIAC GOSPELS.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST, D. D.

THE obscurest period in the history of the Church is that immediately succeeding the Apostolic age. The sources for the study of the first half of the second century after Christ are very meagre. Difficult questions have arisen, and for the answering of these we have hitherto had but few authoritative witnesses. Whatever, therefore, may help to throw light on that formative period is eagerly sought after and heartily welcomed. Happily, the last few decades have been rich in discoveries having important bearings on what has all along been dark or uncertain. We need only mention the long-lost Diatessaron of Tatian, so successfully reconstructed by Zahn in 1881; the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, published by Bryennios in 1883; the Apology of Aristides, found by F. Rendel Harris in 1889 and published in 1891; and the Akhmim fragment of the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter, found by the French Archaeological Mission in Egypt, and edited by Prof. Swete in 1893.

But more important, perhaps, than any of these is the Syriac codex of the four Gospels recently discovered in the Monastery of St. Catharine at Mount Sinai, of which the original text and an English translation by the fortunate discoverer were given to the world at the close of last year. The unquestioned antiquity of this Syriac version, and the startling character of some of its readings, have aroused the highest degree of interest among Biblical scholars, both in England and on the Continent. It has already led to a learned controversy which, while it relates primarily to questions of textual criticism, threatens to invade the domain of dogmatic theology. The discussion is conducted by some of the ablest and most learned scholars. In all probability it will not reach a speedy conclusion. The questions involved are intricate and difficult, and require for their solution the widest and most careful comparison of the earliest manuscripts and versions at our command. At all events, inasmuch as this new Syriac Codex is destined to play an important rôle in the future criticism of the Gospels, we propose, at the request of the editors of the REVIEW, to give a brief account of it and of the controversy it has called forth. We do not presume to enter the lists as a combatant. That would require a special training, and a kind and amount of scholarship to which we can lay no claim. We shall simply report the discussion as carried on by others, without criticism of the positions maintained or of the arguments employed.\*

On Mount Sinai stands the celebrated Monastery of St. Catharine. It was here, where Tischendorf, in 1859, discovered what is probably the oldest Greek manuscript of the Bible—the Codex Sinaiticus, marked *N*, and where J. Rendel Harris, in

\* In the preparation of this article we have made very free use of the following: *The New Syriac Gospels*, by Rendel Harris. CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, November, 1894, republished in CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, to which we refer, not having the CONTEMPORARY at hand, December, 1894. *The Sinaitic Palimpsest of the Syriac Gospels*, by Canon Farrar, in THE EXPOSITOR, January, 1895: and a series of papers in THE ACADEMY, which have appeared weekly from November 17 up to date.

1889, discovered the *Apology of Aristides*, that this priceless Codex, containing unquestionably the oldest Syriac translation of the Gospels, the very existence of which was unsuspected, was happily found, after being hidden for centuries from human gaze. The monastery is rich in manuscripts. The oldest Syriac manuscripts, written in the ancient Estrangela character, are kept, not in the main library, but "in a little room, half-way up a dark stair, and partly in a dark closet, approached through a room almost as dark, where they repose in two closed boxes, and cannot be seen without a lighted candle." The monks, profoundly ignorant, can neither read them nor form an estimate of their value. It is to be feared that, through their stupidity and carelessness, much that might have proved of incalculable service to Biblical science has been suffered to perish from damp and decay. It will be remembered that Tischendorf found the Codex Sinaiticus in a waste-paper basket, thus providentially saving it from being ignobly used for kindling fires.

The Syriac Codex was discovered by a lady, Mrs. Lewis, widow of the late Rev. S. S. Lewis, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The finding was not purely accidental: for J. Rendel Harris had suggested to her the probability that a diligent search among the Estrangela manuscripts of the monastery might be rewarded by the recovery of something valuable. For such a task she was well equipped, having previously studied not only ancient and modern Greek, but also Syriac, Arabic and Hebrew. In view of the possibility of some important find, Mr. Harris taught her the art of photographing manuscripts, lent her his own camera, and devised a stand which would save her from fatigue; and Mr. F. C. Burkitt taught her how to copy the ancient Estrangela writing. Thus trained, and carrying with her letters from influential dignitaries, she—with her twin sister, Mrs. Gibson\*—journeyed to Mount Sinai, and in February, 1892, while standing with her sister and Father Gal-

\* She has given the history of the discovery in *How the Codex was Found*, 1893.

akteon, the librarian of the monastery, in the already-mentioned small dark room, she discovered the Codex, which, as regards its value, surpassed all she could have hoped to find.

It is a palimpsest manuscript of 358 pages; its leaves were mostly glued together, and had sometimes to be held over the steam of a kettle. "The upper writing of the palimpsest is probably A. D. 778, and is a Hagiography of female saints. The under-writing, which is centuries earlier, is mainly a copy in red ink of the four Gospels in Syriac."

Returning to Cambridge, the sisters developed at their leisure the photographs they had taken of the Codex. One day in July Mr. Burkitt and Prof. Bensly were permitted to see them, and they pronounced the palimpsest a variant copy of the Curetonian Gospels. On the very next day, it was decided, that a party consisting of Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, Mr. and Mrs. Burkitt, and Prof. and Mrs. Bensly would, as soon as possible, go to Sinai and transcribe the entire manuscript. Accompanied by J. Rendel Harris, they reached the monastery February 8, 1893. "Galakteon, then Hegoumenos, or abbot, gave them every facility, and the little party faced their heroic task. In many places the under-writing of the palimpsest had faded, but became decipherable after the use of a strong composition for reviving ancient writing, which Mrs. Lewis had brought from the British Museum. The result of their labors was that they brought home with them a transcription of all that is decipherable of the complete text of this Syriac version of the separated Gospels.

It is to be regretted that the colophon giving the date of the manuscript and the place of its transcription is illegible; but experts, judging from its style of writing, the absence of diacritic points, and other peculiarities, believe the copy was made not later than the beginning of the fifth century, and possibly a half-century earlier. Mrs. Lewis, at the time of the discovery, stated that the text of the Gospels could not possibly be later than the middle of the fifth century. She says, "This was a mere guess from external probabilities, without any

scientific basis; and, so far as I know, even the approximate date has yet to be determined. If I were entitled to a second guess from internal evidence, I should place it considerably earlier."\*

As to the version itself, both Mr. Burkitt and Mr. Harris, the surviving transcribers (Prof. Bensly having since died), ascribe it to the second century. Dr. Nestle, in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 20, 1894, has expressed the opinion that the newly-recovered text is no duplicate of the Curetonian, but the very earliest translation of the Gospels into Syriac, and that on it both the Curetonian and the Diatessaron are founded. If he is correct in this (and there is hardly room for doubt), we have now recovered the form of the Gospels as they were extant in Syriac not later than A. D. 150, and that in a text, not indeed complete, but still far more complete than in the Curetonian fragments; for only about four hundred and fifty verses are missing, and a few parts illegible.

The critical value of this newly-recovered text, which is designated *Sin.*, cannot be too highly estimated. There is not the least doubt, according to Rendel Harris, that as far as Syriac Gospels are concerned it is "superior in antiquity to anything yet known," and allowing for a few serious blemishes, "superior in purity to all extant copies, with a few exceptions." The oldest and best Uncial manuscripts are: the Codex Sinaiticus, designated by the letter **N**, now at St. Petersburg, and written according to Tischendorf, its discoverer, about the middle of the fourth century, A. D.; and the Codex Vaticanus, designated by the letter **B**, in the Vatican Library at Rome, and written about the same time as the Sinaiticus. With these authorities the new palimpsest very generally agrees. Yet at times it presents readings differing from those of **N B**; and it is remarkable that it does this just where the best critics regard **N B** as wrong, thus showing its independence of **N B**. "Mr. Burkitt states that out of ninety-five instances in which the readings of **N B** are rejected and relegated to the margin by Westcott and Hort, *Sin.* is legible in eighty-two, and only coin-

\* THE ACADEMY, Dec. 8, 1894.

cides with **N B** in twenty-three of these; and in all but two of these readings the combination **N B Sin.** is supported by the whole mass of authorities, except *D latt.*,<sup>\*</sup>—that is, the Latin text of Codex Bezae. Manifestly, then, a reading supported by these three oldest authorities has the strongest probability in its favor.

The value of *Sin.* is often apparent from its omissions. The story of the adulteress in John vii: 53–viii: 11 is wanting, as in the majority of early texts; so, too, are the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel, though found in the Diatessaron, and supported by a few authorities. *Sin.* has a substantially shorter text than the majority of extant documents, giving, for example, the Lord's Prayer in Luke xi: 2–4, in its briefest form; and omitting, with Westcott and Hort, Matthew xii: 47: "Then one said unto Him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without seeking to speak with thee;" and Matthew xvii: 21, "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." The bloody sweat is absent (Luke xxii: 43, 44), as well as the reconciliation of Herod and Pilate (Luke xxiii: 10–13). It has almost none of the passages generally held to be interpolations; nor does it seem to have been amplified by additions from collateral documents.†

But now, in view of the antiquity and excellence of this Syriac version, we are surprised to find at the very beginning of Matthew's Gospel a reading decidedly opposed to the orthodoxy of the Church. In chapter i: 16, the paternity of Jesus is distinctly and intentionally assigned to Joseph, the husband of Mary. *Joseph*, we are told, *begat Jesus*. And that he who gave to the world the Sinaitic text in its present form meant this, is further evident from other features of the narrative of the Lord's birth. To make this clear to the eye, we here give in parallel columns the Revised version of the Greek text, and an English version of the Sinaitic text, of Matthew i: 16–25, italicising those parts in *Sin.* that are of special critical importance.

\* EXPOSITOR, p. 8.

† CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, p. 79; EXPOSITOR, pp. 9, 10.

R. V.

16. Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

17. So all the generations from Abraham unto David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away to Babylon fourteen generations; and from the carrying away to Babylon unto the Christ fourteen generations.

18. Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

19. And Joseph, her husband, being a righteous man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily.

20. But when he thought on these things, behold an angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

21. And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.

22. Now all this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying:

23. Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us.

24. And Joseph arose from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord commanded him, and took unto him his wife;

25. And knew her not till she had brought forth a son; and she called his name Jesus:

SIN.

Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph (to whom was espoused the Virgin Mary) begat Jesus, who is called Christ.

All these generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David to the Babylonian exile fourteen generations; and from the Babylonian exile to the Christ fourteen generations.

Now the birth of Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph, when they had not come together, she was found with child from the Holy Ghost.

But Joseph, her husband, because he was just, was unwilling to expose Mary; and he was minded that he would quietly divorce her.

But while he was meditating on these things there appeared to him an angel of the Lord in a vision and said to him, Joseph, son of David, fear not to take Mary thy wife, for that which { is } will be } born of her is from the Holy Ghost.

She shall bear thee a son, and { thou shalt } call his name Jesus; { she shall } for he shall save the people from their sins.

Now this which happened (was) that there might be fulfilled, that which was spoken by the Lord in Isaiah the prophet, who had said:

Behold the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which is by interpretation, our God with us.

But, when Joseph rose from his sleep he did as the angel commanded him and he took his wife;

And she bare him a son, and he called his name Jesus.

A comparison of the two texts forces upon us a curious problem. In the *first* place, according to the Greek version of the story of the birth, Jesus had no human father. Joseph was only his step-father, and knew not his wife till she had brought forth a son. The male factor was eliminated from the conception. But according to the Syriac version, Jesus was born in the way of ordinary generation. Joseph was his real father according to the flesh, not merely his legal father. Both factors, the male and the female, were active in his conception. Astonishing as this is, it could not be more definitely and explicitly stated than in i:16, the closing verse of a genealogy which leads up from Abraham to Joseph, who, we are told, "*begat* Jesus." It is seen, also, at other places of the narrative. In i:21, the angel says to Joseph, "she shall bear *thee* a son;" and in i:25, it is said, "she bare *him* a son." And how significant is the *omission* from this verse of the words, "and knew her not till she had brought forth a son," as well as the change of gender from the feminine of the Greek to the masculine of the Syriac; so that the clause reads, not "she," but "he called his name Jesus," emphasizing the paternal right of Joseph to name the child.

But now, in the *second* place, to complicate the problem, the Syriac text has, side by side with this naturalistic view of the conception and birth of Jesus, the usual supernaturalistic view. Erase the closing verse (v. 16) from the genealogy, and the italicised words and clauses from the narrative, and then restore the words omitted from v. 25, and you have the same version as in the Greek. In both, before Joseph and Mary had come together, she was found with child from the Holy Ghost. In both, Joseph being a just man, was unwilling to expose her, and intended to divorce her quietly. In both, an angel appears to him in a vision, and tells him not to fear to take Mary his wife, for what is born of her is from the Holy Spirit. In both, the child is to be named Jesus, because he shall save from sin. In both, there is the same reference to the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy of the Virgin. In both, Joseph obeyed the angel's

command, and took Mary as his wife. And what is particularly striking is, that in v. 16, where the Greek has simply Mary, the Syriac has the *Virgin Mary*.

What means this strange commingling of naturalism and supernaturalism, of heterodoxy and orthodoxy? How are we to understand a birth that is ordinary, and yet is extraordinary? There seems at least a combination of elements that are mutually exclusive. Or, is this only in the seeming? May not this Syriac version, when read from the right point of view, be strictly homogeneous and self-consistent? If not, then we are forced to hold, *either* that it has preserved in some of its details the primitive form of the Gospel, *or* that it exhibits a depravation of that primitive form. "We see the Gospel," says Harris, "either in the process of formation, as the sources are gradually combined until they reach the final orthodox form, or in the process of primitive contamination under the influence of the earliest perverting hands." \*

Such is the problem; and it is one the solution of which will require the most careful and conscientious study. It must not be hastily thrust aside, because the document which forces it upon our attention contravenes our previously formed dogmatic opinions. We must show that our new authority does not carry us back of all other extant authorities and disclose to us the original form of the history of our Lord's birth. Nor will it do to refuse to consider the problem because it seems absurd that among several thousand documents containing the Gospel, the true reading "should have been preserved in only a single copy, and that copy not in the original language;" for scholars are aware of a "number of cases in which readings are accepted on the authority of a single Greek uncial, or a couple of Greek uncials, flanked by a solitary version; in which cases the disappearance of a single Greek copy, or a couple of Greek copies, would throw the attestation of what is considered the correct reading upon the shoulders of their solitary supporting version.

\* CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, p. 80.

The Syriac manuscript from Mount Sinai is not, therefore, to be considered necessarily wrong because it stands alone." \*

Writing with reference to two papers (which we shall notice further on), by Mr. Conybeare and Mr. Badham, in which they maintain that the primitive Gospel knew nothing of a super-human birth, Canon Farrar remarks: "It is needless to say that such views—and we are destined to have more of them—will not be knocked down by mere blows from the mace of authority; and it would be equally needless for me to say that I do not wish, even for a moment, to use against them the base *argumentum ad invidiam*. Views which we regard as errors or as heresies must be met, and can only be effectually met, by calm and incontrovertible reasoning, not by the swash-buckler denunciations in which ecclesiastical orthodoxy usually delights, because it cannot any longer resort to the desperate sincerity of the fagot and stake, as it did in the days of papal supremacy, or may do again if priests get the upper hand. Mr. Badham and Mr. Conybeare are scholars and men of learning; and if their views are to be refuted, it can only be by serious arguments, not by contemptuous anathemas. Some may be eager to regard the new readings as genuine because they are unorthodox; we should only be following a bad and unscientific example, if for the same reason we refuse to examine them." †

Now, what attempts have been made to meet the difficulty confronting us in the Sinaitic text, viz., that Jesus is the son of Joseph and yet is virgin-born?

Mr. Allen ‡ escapes all difficulty by denying that there is any *real* difficulty. The text as it stands has, he thinks, nothing unnatural about it. The supposed inconsistency is due to our looking at the facts from our modern standpoint, and not from that of the early Christians. He calls attention to the terms of human relationship used throughout the section of the Holy Family: "Joseph begat Jesus" (v. 16); Joseph the husband

\* CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, p. 80. † EXPOSITOR, Jan., 1895, pp. 12, 13.

‡ ACADEMY, Dec. 15, 1894.

of Mary (v. 19); Mary the wife of Joseph (vs. 20, 24); Mary bears a son to Joseph (vs. 21, 25); Joseph exercises the paternal right in giving the child his name. So far the language is that of every-day family life. But it must be noticed how carefully the writer guards against misconception. At the very moment when, from a legal standpoint, it might be said that "Joseph begat Jesus," Mary was, as a matter of fact, still a virgin (v. 16). Further, at the time of the conception of her child there had been no intercourse between the so-called husband and wife (v. 18). And the writer sees in this a fulfillment of the prophetic saying that a virgin should conceive (Is. vii. 14, cf. v. 22). "In all this," he remarks, "it is impossible to see two theologically different conceptions of the nativity of our Lord, striving to oust one another from the text. The threads of the narrative are too finely woven to be so rudely handled; and, on the other hand, the simplicity and directness of the terms used of Joseph's paternity, would seem to carry us back to the first days of the Christian Church."

Why should it be impossible, he asks, for a writer who believed in the Virgin-birth to use the phrase: "Joseph begat Jesus?" We have long been accustomed to phrases like the following: "Joseph her husband" (Matthew i. 19); "Mary thy wife" (v. 20); "took unto him his wife" (v. 24); "his father and his mother" (Luke ii. 33); "his parents" (v. 41); "thy father and I" (v. 48); and we find no difficulty in them nor try to explain them away as Ebionite interpolations, and so a writer, who wished to trace the Davidic descent of our Lord, would see no difficulty, in a legal point of view, in the phrase: "Joseph begat Jesus;" and having used it once, the other phrases would seem natural enough, where he was speaking of Joseph and his family from a social standpoint, always remembering that the idea of the Virginal conception underlies his whole narrative, and that these naturalistic phrases are meant to be interpreted in the light of it.

Of Mr. Allen's theory, Mr. Charles thinks \* that, being weak

\* ACADEMY, Dec. 29, 1894.

on the side of documentary evidence, it can only be saved in case the internal evidence is irresistible. But is it such? That the account of the nativity in the new codex is "homogeneous, and consistent throughout," can only be maintained on the theory of Joseph's legal fatherhood applied, not merely to i. 16, but to the exegesis of the entire chapter. But students in the past have always been dissatisfied, even with its limited application to i. 16. A mere statement of this interpretation in unvarnished terms is enough, Mr. Charles believes, to secure its condemnation. "First of all, in reading i. 16, we are to supply the word 'legally' — 'And Joseph, to whom Mary the Virgin was espoused, begat (legally) Jesus.' Next, in v. 21, we find the angel instructing Joseph in the duties of a legal Jewish father. — 'Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, and she shall bear to thee (legally) a son, and thou (as the legal father) shalt call his name Jesus.' Finally, in v. 25, — 'She bare to him (legally) a son, and he (as the legal father) called his name Jesus.' I think many, on hearing this piece of exegesis, will re-echo the remark addressed to me by a well-known Jewish scholar in reference to the interpretation of Mr. Allen: 'I want no more Midrashim.' The verdict as to its validity may, I think, be safely left to sound English common-sense."

Mr. Allen's paper, however, commends itself as one of great value to Dr. Sanday, who remarks: \* "As a step towards the solution of the problem, it seems to me the most helpful which has yet appeared; and I do not think it is open to all the strictures which have been passed upon it. I do not see that it can be rightly described as 'Midrash;' and I doubt if the phenomena of the text have been anywhere set forth so clearly and well."

Most scholars, however, see a real difficulty in our new codex, and in seeking a solution of it proceed along one or other of two lines. While some presuppose a naturalistic basis, to which supernaturalistic features were added, others presuppose a supernaturalistic basis, which was altered by some scribe in the interest of Ebionite views.

\* ACADEMY, Jan. 5, 1895.

The first of these positions is taken by Mr. Conybeare.\* He rejects the hypothesis that an originally orthodox text is here in process of being hereticised, for the following reasons :

1. That the genealogy finds its only logical and possible conclusion in the new form of v. 16, and was intended to show that Joseph is the real father of Jesus.

2. That the genealogy so desired cannot be detached from the text as a later addition.

3. That the new features of the text in vs. 16, 21, 25 are not idiosyncrasies of the new Syriac text, but were once part of a widely diffused and established text ; for the words of the Greek text of v. 25 : " And he knew her not until she had brought forth a son," are omitted from the best representative of the ancient African Latin version.

4. A heretic, anxious to produce a naturalistic text, would not have been content with such slight changes of the new text, but would have made a clean sweep at least of v. 19.

Mr. Conybeare, however, sees and endeavors to meet the difficulties in the way of his own hypothesis of an originally un-orthodox text in process of becoming orthodox. 1. If it be objected that no orthodox person trying to make the text orthodox would have retained vs. 16, 21, 25, he deems it a sufficient answer to this objection to say that most orthodox copyists would not ; and the fact that this is the only codex in which v. 16 is found, in what must have been its original form, proves that they did not so leave it. In the new codex the primitive text of v. 16 is still respected, as it was not by the writers of any of our other ancient codices.

2. If a naturalistic account of the birth stood in the earliest text, how, it may be asked, shall we account for vs. 18-20, and vs. 22, 23 ? In explanation of the very difficult problem implied in this objection, Mr. Conybeare says : " The Jews, in the time of Christ, deemed it possible and natural for a child to be conceived of the Holy Spirit, and yet, at the same time, to be begotten in the ordinary way. The two processes lay in dif-

\* *ACADEMY*, Nov. 17, 1894.

ferent spheres. The one gave his soul or reason, which was a gift of the Divine Spirit; the other process gave his flesh, blood and the faculties of sense." In terms of such a philosophy as this which he finds in Philo, from whom he quotes, a woman might be said to conceive her child of the Holy Spirit in respect of its soul, while, at the same time, she would conceive it in respect of its flesh, blood and sensuous faculty in the natural manner through intercourse with a human husband. So it is that the angel assures Joseph that Mary has conceived the future Messiah "of the Holy Spirit," and yet in the same breath bids him take his wife to himself and procreate the Messiah in the usual way.

3. Mr. Conybeare admits that vs. 19 and 20 conflict with his interpretation. Else, why was Joseph minded to put his bride away privily? Why should the angel bid Joseph not to *fear* to marry Mary, unless his apprehensions had been already roused? But Mr. Conybeare thinks that in these verses we have the gloss of carnally minded persons, who were too dull to comprehend the purely spiritual import of the statement that Mary had conceived by the Holy Spirit, of persons who could only understand that which they could see and handle, and who thus introduced into our text a confusion of the Divine fatherhood with the human.

4. Still another objection might be alleged against the view that Joseph was the real father, not simply the step-father, of Jesus, viz., the occurrence in Matt. i. 16 of the phrase, "Mary the Virgin." Mr. Conybeare meets this in a remarkable way. "Let us suppose," he says, "that Mary, after the death of Joseph, her child's natural father, became one of the 'widows' of the early Christian community at Jerusalem (cf. Acts vi. 1). In such case she would have been known to her contemporaries as 'Mary the Virgin.' For widows who, after their husband's death, rejected second wedlock and lived holily, had, in the earliest church, the rank and title of 'virgin.'"

Mr. Harris, too, brings forward the objection which lies in the use of the expression, the "Virgin Mary," in Matthew i. 16,

and urges it against the priority of the new Syriac readings. According to him, it is a late expression relatively to the New Testament. Even in the Apology of Aristides, one of the earliest witnesses for the Virgin birth, Mary is simply called "a Hebrew virgin;" so that if we were to receive the words "Virgin Mary" as a popular and understood title, into the earliest form of the Gospel, we should be guilty of an anachronism.

So, too, he presses with much force the inconsistency of the Sinaitic narrative as a whole—an inconsistency which, he says, cannot be removed, except by withdrawing the whole section concerning the angelic vision. "Try and accommodate the incident of the angelic vision to the definitely expressed paternity of Joseph, and you will be obliged to erase the statements that Mary was with child before marriage; that the conception was from the Holy Spirit; that the prophecy was fulfilled that a virgin should conceive, as well as the clause actually absent in the Sinaitic text, 'he knew her not till she had brought forth a son.' Even the casual remark, that Joseph was a just man, would have to be removed, as being, on the hypothesis of the accuracy of the Sinaitic text, inconsistent with his conduct before the vision, and the meditated divorce which was prevented by the vision. We should have to reduce the Infancy section to shreds before it would satisfy an adoptionist hypothesis; and we can, therefore, only conclude that this section of the text was, in the first instance, not an adoptionist, but an orthodox, product, from which it follows at once that the adoptionist variants which occur in the Angel section are depravations."

The majority of those who have thus far written on the new Syriac Codex presuppose an orthodox basis, on which heterodox features were grafted. This is the position assumed by Mr. Charles, in an able letter in the *Academy*, December 1, 1894. When engaged in comparing our palimpsest word for word with the Curetonian fragments and the Peshitta version, as well as with the Greek text and the Latin versions, he found that, whereas its strange reading of Matthew i. 16 was in some measure supported by the Old Latin and Armenian versions,

its peculiar readings in vs. 18-25 were practically devoid of such support. In vs. 1-16 we have a genealogy of Joseph, and that it should close as it does in the Syriac text: "Jacob begat Joseph: Joseph, to whom Mary the Virgin was espoused, begat Jesus, who is called Christ"—is just what one should *a priori* expect. By this reading every difficulty of exegesis is removed. Then vs. 1-16 are a consistent whole, and supply us with an Ebionitic genealogy of Jesus which represents Him as the natural son of Joseph. Both on internal and external grounds we must reject the Ebionitic readings in these verses as due to willful corruptions of the text. Assuming, then, that v. 16 of the Syriac codex is primitive, we have two distinct documents confronting each other: the former representing Jesus as the natural offspring of Joseph; the latter representing His birth as of a distinctly supernatural nature.

The question now arises, Which is the work of the Evangelist or writer of the complete Gospel? The question, Mr. Charles thinks, is not difficult to answer. First, all internal grounds make it evident that the account of the superhuman birth formed part of the original Gospel. The spiritual presuppositions of vs. 18-25, and of the rest of the first Gospel, are the same, and exactly the same method of citing Old Testament prophecy is followed in both; whereas, in vs. 1-17 no attempt is made to cite Old Testament prophecy bearing on the Davidic descent of the Messiah, although no better opportunity could have presented itself than that given at the close of this section. Secondly, the internal grounds are supported by external testimony; for both Justin Martyr and Tatian's Diatessaron omit vs. 1-17, though they reproduce vs. 18-25.

Accordingly Mr. Charles holds that the genealogy, vs. 1-17, does not belong organically to the first Gospel, but was wrongly prefixed by the final redactor of the Gospel, or more probably by a mere scribe. This holds good, too, of the genealogy in the third Gospel (Luke iii. 23-38), for it is obvious, even on the most cursory examination, that iv. 1 should follow on iii. 22. It is no less obvious that this genealogy also has been tampered

with in order to adapt it to its new environment; for, instead of "was called" in the Syriac text, we find "was supposed" in the Greek.

"These genealogies," he maintains, "were probably not incorporated universally in the Greek manuscripts before 170 A.D. In their original uncorrected form they held their ground in the Greek Gospels possibly for only a few decades. During this short period the old Syriac translation was made. The original text, however, soon gave place to some form resembling that found in the Curetonian manuscripts and in the old Latin and Armenian versions. Finally this form gave place, early in the third century, to the radically different text which is now found in all Greek manuscripts."

Mr. Rendel Harris occupies much the same ground as Mr. Charles. He seeks to trace the influence of the new readings in the Greek, Latin, and Armenian texts, and applying the maxim that coincidence of readings implies community of ultimate origin for such readings, he believes that the ancestry of the group of new readings coincides with the ancestry of a great variety of manuscripts diffused in different languages. He does not hesitate to say that in following these manuscripts back to their source, we should pass through a manuscript in which the text was arranged as we see it in the new Syriac Codex. At the same time, he gravely doubts the genuineness of the variant, "Joseph begat Jesus." He regards the genealogies, of which there is reason to believe that many were current in the primitive Church, as mere fossils, belonging to certain strata of belief—the drift-wood of early controversies, carried down in the gulf-stream of evangelical literature. They were compiled to confirm existing opinions, rather than to produce beliefs. Their value consists in the disclosure of the opinions which called for their production; and not in the genealogies themselves, and it is quite possible that every school of thought, Christian or Judæo-Christian, had its *Sepher Toledoth*, or Book of Generations.\*

\* CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, p. 84.

Mr. Conybeare \* replies to Mr. Charles, taking up his arguments in order. Mr. Charles had discredited Matthew i. 1-17, because they contain no appeal to Old Testament prophecy. But Mr. Conybeare thinks no such appeal is necessary, inasmuch as the conviction that the Messiah was to be born of the house of David was so ingrained in Jewish minds that to quote prophecy, by way of proving it to them, was altogether superfluous. The conviction is rather presupposed by the pedigree. Every Jew admitted that the Messiah was to be of the house of David; but not every Jew, that He was to be born of a virgin. Hence Isaiah is invoked by the author of vs. 18-25 to prove the latter point; but the former was assumed by the writer of the pedigree as something self-evident. Mr. Charles implies that Justin did not know of the genealogy; but Mr. Conybeare affirms that he did, though he admits that Justin gives the genealogy to Mary, having clearly made use of some apocryphal Gospel, which boldly appropriated Joseph's genealogy to Mary. As to Tatian, critics have long ago pointed out that his encratite and heretical leanings forbade him to give the genealogies, which, moreover, may, in Tatian's time, have lost their interest for the Church, "which was no longer mainly Jewish." Mr. Charles, in fact, would have us believe in a phenomenon unparalleled in the history of texts, for he supposes there was at first an orthodox Matthew, beginning with v. 18. To this orthodox Gospel Ebionite heretics tacked on in front seventeen heretical verses, leaving, however, intact the orthodox section (vs. 18-25). Then the orthodox, instead of simply disowning the heretical addition (vs. 1-17), adopted it in their copies "universally," as early as A.D. 170. Lastly, they tried to palliate the heretical element, so needlessly admitted into their aforetime orthodox Gospel, by "deliberately" correcting v. 16. Who will accept such a theory of textual development?

It has been our purpose to lay before the reader a clear, plain account of the controversy which has been called forth by the new Syriac Codex. We have simply given the essential points

\* ACADEMY, Dec. 8, 1894.

of a discussion which is evidently only in its initial stage. Thus far it has been carried on mainly by English scholars. The Germans remain to be heard from. Zahn and Nestle have already written on the subject. Harnack and others are busily engaged in studying the question. The controversy is one of great importance to Biblical science, and every scholar will watch its progress with interest.

## II.

### REFLECTIONS ON THE EPIPHANY—WITH HELPS.\*

BY REV. GEORGE F. MULL, A. M.

IN contemplating the Epiphany of Christ, we cannot leave out of consideration the supernatural character which, in the last analysis, distinguishes all the essential facts upon which our unconscious (subconscious?) spiritual life reposes, and upon which also the organized, rational system of our religious life is based. In making this statement, we are simply uttering a truism; for, a religion, to be at all adequate to our human needs, must have in it the self-authenticating power of God, as constituting its source, its substance, and its steadfast light, that is ever beckoning the weary pilgrim on to a participation in the fulfillment of its glorious promise and purpose—redemption and salvation. The light, piercing through the gloom of this our earthly night, shineth unto the perfect day; the power of God unto salvation, embracing in the comprehensive largeness of its scope the whole human family,—this is the thought that must rule in our meditations upon the Epiphany of Christ, whether the subject be viewed philosophically or historically, or in the deeper, and, as I believe, truer sense, according to which the Divine, around and above and within this “dim spot men call earth,”—the Divine in the spaceless, timeless, changeless realm of pure spirit,—addresses itself to a spark of kindred flame, the Divinity that stirs within every mortal breast. It is this alone that gives universality to religion; it is this alone

\* This is intended to mean that the writer has freely drawn upon such sources as came in his way, without being able at this time clearly to indicate the same, for the reason that the subject-matter was originally gathered without any view of publication.

that makes the idea of catholicity in religion possible; it is this alone that makes the religion of Jesus Christ as all-embracing as the dominion of sin is all-embracing; it is this that gives the religion of Jesus Christ its assured warrant in the reason of man, in the deductions of philosophy, in the discoveries of science, in the relations of history, in the facts of experience, and above all in the satisfied yearnings of the human soul.

Now, it is not difficult to observe the presence and power of the supernatural in the pre-Christian history of the human race on the Jewish side of its development. Here, from the very beginning, on through all the centuries, as many or as few as the scientist will allow us to assume, the conception of Divine Providence is no vague illusion, mysteriously operating through the forces of nature and the instrumentalities common to human existence,—but a distinct, clearly defined entity, a being with whom we cannot refuse to associate personality—will, thought, speech,—appearing now in one form, now in another, but always, and consistently with his purpose, the all-Father, the Omnipotent Jehovah, guiding and directing the affairs of humanity, as vested for the time being in his chosen people, unto their consummation in the fulness of time. Here, surely, there is no mistaking the supernatural character of the forces at work. It is God himself, by his self-revelation in a thousand ways, continually informing the “Messianic promises and hopes, which run like a golden thread, from the protevangelium in paradise lost to the voice of John the Baptist.” This is the positive side in the course of preparation for the nativity of Christ—a continual coming of the Divine into the sphere of the human and earthly.

In the history of the nations outside of Judaism, we may also notice the presence and power of the supernatural,—not, however, in the way of positive, active interposition, but only as controlling the end toward which the whole movement was hastening. Here the process was just the reverse of that of Jewish history; it was from man God-ward, instead of from God man-ward. The effort was to project the human into the Divine, to evolve,

so to speak, out of their inner consciousness and out of the conditions of their natural life, the Divine and its realm,—to construct a celestial kingdom that might answer to the needs of their religious instincts. Hence the elaborate systems of pagan mythology, most of the splendid monuments of pagan art, enshrined in temple, column, statue and poetry, as well as the best of the much-lauded treatises of pagan philosophy,—all attesting the deep-seated feeling after God if haply they might find Him, and also demonstrating the God-like function of the human spirit that could soar so high and embalm itself, as in translucent amber, in such wondrous forms of beauty and wisdom and usefulness. But, as we know, it was all to no avail. The civilizations of the ancient past,—of the far East, of Greece, of Rome,—grand, marvelous, and mighty as they were, show no evidence of progress, according to the eternal standards of progress set by the Divine Mind. It was all on the worldly side, deriving its highest value from its worldly significance, and for that reason was doomed to perish. Still, the Divine purpose was subserved by the very failure of the movement.

The old religions had been fairly tried and found wanting; philosophy had done its best and constructed a moral code that lacked only one thing, the power of regenerative grace, to make it perfect,—but lacking that, it failed; organized government, with its laws, its civil and political institutions, had been brought to such a state of perfection that it was adequate to the supreme task of overspreading the world with universal peace; in a word, all human resources had been allowed free play to the point of utter exhaustion, and from every worldly point of view were crowned with an unparalleled measure of successful achievement. But the peace that reigned was the most bitter irony—a sad, pitiless mockery of the reality. It was literally a dead calm. In its moral and intellectual bearing, the condemnation passed by Tacitus, on his fellow-countrymen was but a reflex of the eternal truth,—“They make a desert, and they call it Peace!” The problem of life was still unsolved; the ascending cry of fallen humanity died away in jeering echoes;

human misery had not been alleviated; on the contrary, the social order had been steadily degenerating until the latent seeds of corruption burst into the foulest fruit. But peace reigned! Yes, the peace of helplessness and hopelessness,—the peace of black night whose impenetrable gloom but made the glittering, fair-seeming aspect of pagan civilization shine the brighter and seem the fairer.

Here, then, we note the character of the preparation that had been unconsciously going forward in the pagan world for the nativity of Christ. It will be seen that it was entirely negative, resulting in an attitude of waiting,—of susceptibility for something, anything that would prove itself capable to raise their dashed hopes, to stay their sinking spirits, and to give peace to their troubled hearts. The void had been created, and there was nothing to fill it; and yet it was a great gain that there was an ever-growing recognition of the void and a felt need of something to fill its cavernous depths. Thus we have prominently brought into view this fact, namely: that on the Jewish side there was a continuous manifestation of God, an unmistakable process of theophany; on the pagan side, a dim groping after the Divine, an unmistakable process of apotheosis;—on the Jewish side, the agency of supernatural powers continuously and visibly operative against the hostility of generation after generation of a perverse and stiff-necked people; on the pagan side, human powers and worldly resources strained to their utmost and forever frustrated in an effort, sublimely heroic, to break the bonds that fettered the upward struggling spirit;—on the Jewish side, triumphant victory of divine love in the realization of its object; on the pagan side, triumphant victory of the curse of sin in the complete demoralization of human society;—on the one side, divine grace as the saving power; on the other, the absence of it as the destroying power.

Now, the realization of the Jews' hope and the consummation of the long series of foreshadowing revelations that mark the progress of their history, are involved in the great fact of Christmas. But the object of Christ's mission into the world as

related to the human race is only half accomplished, and precious as it is, Christmas would be but a sorry season of rejoicing, were it only to commemorate the birth of the Saviour of the Jews. That would be but a partial exhibition of the divine *pronoia* that is revealed at every step of history's march; and it were strange indeed that a deep religious consciousness should have been implanted in the bosom of heathendom, only to find utterance for itself in the wild vagaries of fancy and the unsatisfying deductions of reason, without the certitude of at last being met by its full and proper complement. Something more than Christmas, then, in its literal and more restricted sense, is required to complete the meaning of Christ's birth into the world; and this additional factor we find in his manifestation to the Gentiles, or, in other words, in the Epiphany.

The term, Epiphany, is familiar to us as designating a particular season of the sacred year; as a festival, it does not seem to be any longer observed by the evangelical church of Germany, as it regularly was during the first century of the Reformation. Originally it was closely identified with the nativity of Christ, having at different times, and according to the different views of the Greek and Latin divisions of the Church, various significations. Gradually, however, the ruling idea came to be the call to the heathen world,—“that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.” The cycle of the Epiphany lessons in the “Order of Worship,” will be found to be true to this idea. They mark the method, as has been well said, by which the mystery of the nativity comes to its proper authentication among men,—the gospel lessons taking up the objective attestation and manifestation of the mystery itself, and the epistle lessons generally, what may be called, the subjective side—the attestation and manifestation of the same, in its transforming power, in the life of those in whom the mystery is operative. First, there is the star manifesting to the remotest Gentiles the Child born at Bethlehem,—and the thought comes unbidden that it may have been one of those morning stars of Job, perhaps, that sang to-

gether, here singing in unison with the rapturous voices of the angelic host in the Gloria in Excelsis, as it fell upon the ears of the Jewish shepherds. Next, there is the Holy Child, at twelve years of age, seen in his Father's House,—where the manifestation comes from the person of Christ himself—an inner personal exhibition of His divine mission, the first beginning of the unfathomable process through which the Epiphany is finally made complete. Then, again, we have the first manifestation of our Lord's glory in the working of miracles; and thus we shall find that the Gospels continue through the successive Sundays, opening up to our contemplation a more and more complete manifestation of the Word made Flesh, and come to dwell among us. And with this, the epistles, as already said, on the subjective side, are in perfect harmony.

We instinctively—some of us at least—feel that this is as it should be. Quite apart from theological science (would that I knew more of it!), which, though much derided in certain quarters, has done more for the advancement of the world's highest interests than any other science,—still, quite apart from the schools, the most important of experiences is that which leads to a rational and credible idea of God. "On clear views of God hang the glory and usefulness of human life. If there is no God, there is no hope; life is a dream, and he is happiest who knows no waking." It is one of the saddest signs of the times, we may note in passing, that the daily record of the world's doings discloses so many suicides. The statistics on this subject are absolutely startling, and, along with other indications, seem to point to the conclusion that society, as at present constituted, is not pervaded by a vivifying faith, or even by a realizing sense of the relation of the Infinite to the finite, of the supernatural to the natural, of the enduring realities of the world to come to the transitory things of the world that now is. "If God exists, but has no care for men, or is interested only in the universe and not in individuals, then for us it were as well if there were no God. But God has manifested Himself in a form that can be understood by men. The Incarnation is

not simply a dogma of theology"—although I hope we may still feel free to use the term dogma without laying ourselves open to the charge of presumptuousness,—but the Incarnation, while it is not simply a dogma, can only properly be such, because it is "something demanded by the heart of man and—spiritually discerned—appealing to his highest reason. It gives the only adequate conception of humanity, and the only definite idea of God. It is 'the light of men' concerning Deity, duty, destiny, and is the standard by which all pretended revelations are to be tested. It has relation to all time and to all the universe. The Being disclosed in the Christ is the God of all worlds and of the eternities, and all things are in His hands and will be forever. The Incarnation, in short, condenses all that is revealed of God, and of His purpose concerning man." Before Christ we had heard of God; in Christ we have seen Him,—says Richard Rothe. "The Deity is never far from humanity; He is always in contact with our spirits, and the 'spiritual life' [oh, how terribly misunderstood it is!] is the life of God manifesting itself through the spirits of men. The Holy Spirit is not an 'influence,' but God Himself in spiritual operation and manifestation. The Christ declared that His work would be continued and completed by the Spirit which would abide forever in Christian hearts. This is fundamental. God is in living relation with all who submit their wills to His will, as it is made known in Christ and in conscience," and embodied in the means of grace as organized by divine institution in the Christian Church.

From what has thus far been said, it will be seen that the nativity of Christ, with which the Epiphany is so fundamentally connected, is in no sense an *event*, growing out of antecedent causes and conditions as their effect and product,—here the system of evolution must stop, as it has in reality stopped, though not without first yielding a plentiful crop of the Dead-Sea fruit of agnosticism and unbelief; but it is an *advent*, a coming into the world of an entirely new factor,—not merely a message, but a messenger,—not merely a lofty ideal out of the bosom of the Infinite, but the Infinite in finite form, a person, whose claims

of Divinity are met by a corresponding capacity of fulfillment,—who not only points the way, but is the Way,—who not only proclaims the truth, but is the Truth,—who not only solves the enigma of life, but is the Life in the fullness of its solution. Again, let us emphasize the fact that we have here to do with the incoming of the Divine, and without going into detail, simply remind ourselves of the marvelous display of supernatural forces which accompanied the working out of this great mystery of redemptive love, without which the sacrifice on the cross would have been impossible, from the standpoint of men, as an adequate atonement for the sin of the world, and without which, we may add, that atonement, with all its transfiguring power, would have had no perceptible, or at least no enduring effect upon the march of civilization. Gladstone, being asked what he regarded as the brightest hope for the future, replied, “I should say a maintenance of faith in the Invisible. This is the great hope of the future, the mainstay of civilization. And by that I mean a living faith in a personal God. I do not hold with a stream of tendency. After sixty years of public life, I hold more strongly than ever this conviction, deepened and strengthened by long experience of the reality and the nearness and personality of God.”

There is no intention here to belittle the significance of the human element; but we notice everywhere a dependence of the natural upon the supernatural; and so, in this one example of the perfect union of the Divine and human, we observe a steady subordination of the human to the Divine—a sublime exhibition of human helplessness. Witness the touching appeal: “Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify Thee. I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do—I have manifested Thy name unto men.” And then, as He climbed the lonely mount in the garden of olive trees to pass through the last agony, the agony of death, which seized upon even the Son of God, so long as He was still bound by the laws of the human body, we hear Him exclaim,—“Father, if Thou be willing, let this cup pass from me,”—the bitter cup,

symbol of the sins of humanity crushing Him with their terrible burden. By this agonizing cry the heart of all humanity was touched. Is it too much to say, some one has asked, that with this anguish the Son of God first drew near to the human race?—in this suffering He first bent down to mortals that they might embrace Him lovingly like a mortal brother? But He did not only give utterance to the deepest cry of human weakness, He also gave forth the highest expression of human strength, in that amazing exaltation of self-denial and submission into the rank of the supremest virtue, which finds its greatest riches in poverty, its highest happiness in suffering, its deepest peace in humility,—an expression unparalleled in sublimity,—“Yet not my will, but thine be done;” and so He became the conqueror of the world.

Note, again, how the Epiphany spread. How did the gospel first strike root in the great world-power of the Roman Empire, which still does duty as the most striking example of worldly prosperity? We have already seen that the prevailing schools of philosophy all arrived at the same result—stoical indifference to actual life and a future state, a profound resignation to the gloomy fate that weighed down the world. Religious belief, except in the lowest form of superstition, was absolutely dead. “In the midst of this darkness, a still small voice was heard out of the East, ‘Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;’ and after a while the same voice was heard saying, ‘God so loved the world that He gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life;’ and again, a Roman citizen of Tarsus said, ‘This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.’ There was rest, then, for the weary and heavy laden; there was a God, too, and life everlasting for those who believed in Him and His Son; and so”—not by power and might, nor by the subtle magic of human culture with which, for example, conquered Greece had taken captive the minds of her Roman conquerors; but through these simple means, mysteriously un-

folding the power of God unto salvation, "the new doctrine came to Rome. In that sluggish mass was hid the leaven that was to throw the whole world into ferment; into that dark soil, in which so much that was precious had been interred, a grain of seed was cast that was to grow into a stately tree overshadowing the earth." True, the pious seed grew slowly; but the watchful eye can follow it in history,—

*"I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs."*

How does it stand to-day? The following picture has been drawn by a skillful pen in the hand of a German writer: "The circle between the old and new civilization has closed—every chasm has been bridged. There is an alternative action of old and new forces, a common labor of all the ages and the nations, as if there were no longer any division of time and space, as if there were but one eternal art, one eternal science. Ascending humanity has trodden matter under foot, conquered science, perfected manufactures to undreamt-of uses, and transfigured art. But this light which has so suddenly flamed through the world, also casts its shadows. Progress in art and science matures the judgment"—

*"The thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns"—*

'but judgment becomes criticism, and criticism negation. The dualism which permeates all creation, the creative and the destructive power, the principle of affirmation and denial, cannot be shut out even now, but must continue the old contest which has never yet been decided by man. Critical analysis opposes faith, materialism wars against idealism, pessimism contends with optimism. The human race has reached the utmost limit of knowledge, but this does not content it in its victorious career; it wishes to break through and discover the God concealed behind. Even the heart of God must not escape the scalpel which nothing withstood. But the barrier is insurmountable. And one party, weary of the fruitless toil, pulls back the aspiring ones. 'Down to matter whence you come. What are you seeking? Science has attained the highest goal—

she has discovered the protoplasm whence all organism proceeded! What is the Creator of modern times? A physiological, chemical, vital function within the substance of a cell! Will ye pray to this, suffer for this, ye fools?' Others turn in loathing from this cynical interpretation of scientific results and throw themselves into the arms of beauty and pleasure, seeking there the divinity. And others still, wait, battling between earth and heaven, in the dim belief of being nearest the goal. It is a tremendous struggle, as though the earth must burst under the enormous pressure of power demanding room. Irreconcilable contrasts!" Where shall peace be found?

Max Müller, in his comparative study of religions, says: "When do we feel the blessings of our country more warmly and truly than when we return from abroad? It is the same with regard to religion." That fact is apparent here, and we keenly feel its truth, as we are at times and by the very circumstances of the times, driven to seek refuge in the mystery of divine love with its transporting influence of comfort and consolation. The soul cannot rest until it rest in God, both here and hereafter, and it is perfectly idle to look for it elsewhere; woe betide the individual who attempts to regulate his life—his walk and conversation—in whatever sphere or condition of age or calling, by the precepts of philosophy, or the maxims of society, or the impulse of his own will. This leads us to a few general reflections suggested by what I conceive to be the prevailing tone of the lessons for this season: In one of the typical Gospels—"This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him"—faith evoked by the direct challenge of the supernatural; in one and all of the epistles, the recognition of this same wondrous power as lying at the base of our whole natural life, and without which we, the heirs of the ages, not to speak of the Romans of the first century, must laugh to scorn the man who would address to us such exhortations as are contained in these fragments of the apostolic letters—exhortations that are utterly incomprehensible, save as they fall upon a soul

rendered susceptible by the Spirit of God, and pouring itself out in the fervent prayer of the collects.

Now, if I may venture an opinion, I would hazard the assertion that the central source of all the troubles—social, political, and individual discontent—all that is comprised in the familiar phrase, *the unrest* of this closing decade of the century, is to be found in a lamentable want of faith in the regenerating power of divine grace. The tendency of modern thought and practice is undoubtedly towards the elimination of the supernatural, as an actual and active force, from the affairs of our earthly life. Of this fact, I know of no more significant example in recent times than the Parliament of Religions, with the wild enthusiasm with which its inauguration was hailed, its sessions attended, and its conclusions received. How, in God's name, could the religion of Jesus Christ meet on common ground with other religions of the world, Jewish and pagan, without doing violence to the fundamental principle upon which it rests—the authority of divine revelation? What other effect could it have, but to give the world assurance of the whispered insinuation of skepticism, that one religion is as good as another—that the main thing, after all, is to obey the dictates of reason and conscience in conforming to the moral law as well as we can, especially in our relations to our fellow-men? What mighty word was there spoken of the power of God unto salvation? What clarion voice was heard, so far as the general public could discover, to proclaim the curse of sin, and the only terms upon which that curse can be removed? No; it was all on the human side, and might as well have been called a "Parliament of Philosophies"—a congress of beneficial societies—of Masons, Odd Fellows, Red Men, *et id genus omne*. Sin, divine revelation, faith, salvation, had no place in it, and from the very nature of the case could not have. For they were met together, not for the greater glory of God, but for the glorification of man and his works—true, man in the best phase of his natural development, but still man. The one distinct impression left upon the mind is, that it was a triumph of liberal thought, of

charitable toleration—in a word, of the modern spirit of democracy uttering itself in this most magnificent example of the brotherhood of man: an imposing spectacle surely, but not awe-inspiring, nor bringing us one whit nearer to the goal predicated upon faith by the Apostle in writing to the Galatians: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one"—not in a Parliament of Religions—but "in Jesus Christ."

But, it is said, the lofty conception of the "brotherhood of man" received a stimulus that will be productive of an incalculable amount of good. It is a noble thought, and I yield to no one in reverence for the elevation of spirit that underlies it. But I do not forget that it was the vain dream of poets and the unrealized ideal of moralists ages before Christ came. I do not forget that it was the rallying cry emblazoned on the banners and shrieked from the throats of the French Revolution. I do not forget that it is the slogan most frequently upon the lips of that furious fire-brand of modern civilization—its product, too,—the anarchist. In a word, I remember that sin is the impassable barrier in the way to its actualization, and that faith in Christ, as involving the forgiveness of sin, is the only power that will break down the barrier. "Enthusiasm for humanity" is a good thing, and from it have sprung many noble works of high philanthropy and practical charity, which enter into the great moral treasure-house of the age. But enthusiasm for humanity has no power, and makes no pretension to it, to forgive sin, and so has never yet been able to effect any perceptible—radical and enduring—change in the relation of man to man. It shows itself often in spasmodic outbursts of generous helpfulness and humane consideration that justly deserve the highest praise, but in which we look in vain for the ideal of brotherhood as conceived in the mind of Christ and embodied in the kingdom He came to establish.

How often, it has been bitterly remarked, it is as if the world suddenly exclaimed: "Why, here is Christmas; let us call the poor, the halt, the maimed and the blind on the stage. Turn

the lime-lights on them, and let the orchestra play the Angel's song in Bethlehem, while we prove to them that we are their brothers for at least twenty-four hours in the year. Then the poor wretches may crawl back to their holes for another year; and we will bow ourselves off the stage amid the plaudits of the multitude." It is no exaggeration to say that in this spirit we all, unconsciously, it may be, contribute our share to this superficial and utterly fallacious conception of the brotherhood of man. It is humanitarianism, not religion pure and undefiled, which requires and accomplishes all that humanitarianism professes—that we minister to the poor and afflicted, but also what is infinitely more difficult and fundamental, *that we keep ourselves unspotted from the world*, and for this humanitarianism makes no provision. It is only in this spirit and on this basis that Hindoo, Buddhist, Brahman, Confucianist, Mohammedan, Theosophist, Agnostic, Infidel, Socialist, Jew and Christian could meet together and unite in glorifying the meeting as the brightest efflorescence of nineteenth century civilization. That some benefit may accrue I do not question, but I am persuaded it will not be in any conspicuous degree, to the greater glory of God, except as made so by his over-ruling Providence. On the contrary, I believe that, if it will result in anything apart from momentary exaltation, it will be in an ever-lessening regard for the spiritual, supernatural, divine element in the conception of Christianity. The moral and humanitarian sides, it seems to me, were immoderately exalted above their rightful place; and a tremendous impulse was given to the tendency, already sufficiently marked, to break away from the objective realities, the eternal verities of our holy religion—to separate Christian conduct and practice from the determining influence and enabling power of divine grace.\*

\*The following suggestive paragraph from Leslie Stephen's article on "Matthew Arnold," may be read with interest in this connection: "The true lights of the Christian Church," he (Arnold) says, "are not Augustine, Luther or Bossuet, but a Kempis and Tauler and St. Francis of Sales; not, that is, the legislators or reformers or systematizers of dogma, but the mystics and pietists

The "brotherhood of man" presupposes the "Fatherhood of God," the latter comprehending the former, both centering in Christ, and both the distinct product, involved as working principles, of the religion founded upon His personality. Holy living, righteousness in all its manifold bearings, like salvation, cometh not but by the grace of God, through Christ who hath loved us and given Himself for us. Can any one doubt, most of all a Christian, the absolute dependence of our human life, in all the dull work-a-day routine of weary toil, as well as in the highest reaches of its capabilities and aspirations, upon the incoming of some divine, supernatural factor, described by various names, the most familiar of which is the one I have been using, namely, the grace of God? But here, it must be admitted, "all definitions, however apt and descriptive, fail; and, to borrow a great writer's happy phrase, they are but 'words thrown at a mystery.'" What we do know is, that it is a mighty potential agency, operating through organized means, supplying strength to human weakness, solace to human sorrow,

and men who have uttered the religious sentiment in the most perfect form. . . . The problem here suggested is a very wide one. We may agree that the true value of a religion is in its ethical force. We may admit that the moral ideals embodied in its teaching are the only part which is valuable when we cease to believe in the history or the dogma; and that they still preserve a very high value. We may still be edified by Homer or by *Æschylus*, or by *Socrates* and *Epictetus*, though we accept not a word of their statements of fact or philosophy. But can the essence of a religion be thus preserved intact, when its dogma and its historical assertions are denied? Could *St. Paul* have spread the church of the Gentiles without the help of the theories which *Arnold* regards as accretions? Would the beautiful spirit of the mystics have conquered the world as well as touched the hearts of a few hermits, without the rigid framework of dogmas in which they were set, and the great ecclesiastical organization for which a definite system was required? We may love the mystical writers, but without the organizers of churches and creeds, can we believe that they would even have made a Church for the world? To set forth a great moral ideal is undoubtedly an enormous service. But the prosaic mind will ask: "Is it enough to present us with ideals?" Do we not also require statements of fact? It is all very well to say be good, and to say this and that is the real meaning of goodness, but to make men good, you have also got to tell them why they should be good, and to create a system of discipline and dogma for effectually stimulating their love of goodness."

certainly to human faith, and so happiness to human misery, with its end in the endlessness of everlasting life—something vastly different from the merely negative conception of immortality.

It is for this that the Epiphany of Christ stands—"God revealing Himself as man, an atonement for sin, salvation through suffering, an assured hope of everlasting life, and that wondrous, too much neglected organism, the Church, which, persisting through so many vicissitudes, has played so large a part in the drama of human life." All this and vastly more it means to the Christian, and it behooves us to hold fast to our faith in these fundamental facts. If we can do without them—to appropriate the thought and much of the language of the greatest of England's statesmen—if the precious fruits they have already borne can be counted on as remaining perennially fresh, after the tree that produced them has been sapped of its life by the ruthless hacking away of its roots,—if what was manifested can be retained in the moral and spiritual results which have entered into the patrimony of Christendom, and at the same time the manifesting Person and all that His ever-living personality entails be thrust aside,—if that can be called a fitting type of Christian Brotherhood with a Christianity emasculated and emptied of that which fifty generations of Christians have believed to be the soul and spring-head of its life—then, indeed, the Parliament of Religions may be regarded as the noblest expression of the spirit of the times.\* And if it be a true expression of the prevailing spirit of our day in its religious aspect, then surely we cannot be far wrong in concluding that the most significant, and hence the most alarming,

\* Another writer expresses this thought thus: "This secularizing of the idea of life is, at the lowest, a doubtful and dangerous experiment. Even assuming socialistic economics to be sound, to put ethics before religion, and conduct before worship, to weaken the union between the human deed and the divine motive, to seek to realize the Fatherhood of God through the brotherhood of man, is to reverse all tried and tested ways of promoting human virtue and happiness. It is to plant the tree with its roots in the air, or to cause the stream to flow backward in its channel."—Walter Walsh, *Contemporary Review*, January, 1895.

characteristic of that spirit is, as already intimated, a growing tendency to expel the "preternatural element from Christianity and destroy its dogmatic structure," all of which involves "a very low estimate, or none at all, of both the quantity and the quality of sin: of its amount, spread like a deluge over the world, and of the subtlety, intensity, and virulence of its nature." In the face of this problem, have we still faith in the Church—the Church, with its wondrous endowment of gifts, and powers, and sacraments, and holy ordinances; the home of the Spirit, the divinely-instituted organ for the continuance and perpetuity of the mediatorial work of Christ, the medium for the operative energy of the whole mystery of God manifest in the flesh, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all?

Now, it seems to me, we are in danger of surrendering all this in our readiness to unite with the secular spirit, which, disguised as an angel of light, is striving to pierce the very heavens with its Babel-tower of humanitarian devices. But this is a lofty theme and a difficult—far too lofty and difficult for me; and nothing but a sense of its profound importance could have induced me to essay the lighter task of touching upon its outskirts. I now leave it with the words of one whose voice was often heard in eloquent and solemn warning of this subtle danger. Speaking of the generic spirit of Anti-Christ, Dr. Nevin says: "What else than this have we, in fact, in the reigning humanitarianism of the present age, which we find so much bent everywhere on resolving the 'powers of the world to come' into a mere exaltation of the powers of the world that now is (physical, social, scientific, industrial, civilizational, educational, politico-economical, and what not), outside of the mediatorial mystery altogether? We have only to try it by the old touchstone, the simple but potent Ithuriel's-spear of St. John. It owns not *ex animo* the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. The constitution of Christ's person is not for it the principle of all Christian faith. In one word, it has no power to feel itself at home in the Apostles' Creed."

In conclusion, I know of no better way to bring home to our minds and hearts the great lesson of the Epiphany glory of

Christ, that the natural order is upheld by the regnancy of spiritual law, and that the moral order of the universe owes its vitality, its stability, and its enabling power, to the supernatural order of divine grace, in which earth and heaven are indissolubly and eternally wedded,—I know of no better way to enforce this truth than by reverting to the miracle at Cana, “foreshadowing as it does the transmuting and glorifying power of our Saviour’s mission in the world, transforming the wants and crude elementary supplies of earthly life into the abundance and sparkling festal freshness of heaven.” And I know of no better interpretation of the miracle than that contained in one of the familiar hymns of this season, which, written by one whose keen vision of faith has since become glorious sight in the realm “across the bar,” may well serve to set the right key for our further meditations upon the subject we have endeavored to present:—

“Thy glory Thou didst manifest,  
O Christ, by miracle divine,  
When, at Thy word, for every guest  
The water sparkled into wine;  
And now, in all the sons of men  
Who feel Thy Spirit’s quick’ning breath,  
That miracle is wrought again,  
As life is kindled out of death.

“What festal raptures fill our hearts  
When heaven and earth are married there!  
What hope, what love the Lord imparts!  
What tenderness and strength of prayer!  
For then *within* His glory glows;  
And gifts and graces all divine  
Again that miracle disclose  
Of water glorified in wine.

“O Christ, unfold Thy quick’ning might  
From day to day, that all may see  
Within each saint, still beaming bright,  
Thy glorious Epiphany:  
And find that best of wine at last,  
That sweetest gift of grace outpoured,  
Richer than Cana’s humble feast,  
The marriage supper of the Lord.”

### III.

#### EVANGELISTS.

BY REV. A. R. KREMER, D. D.

THE apostolic Church, in its ecclesiastical economy, included among its offices and orders that of evangelist. The term explains itself, in a general way, and means simply one who brings and proclaims the glad tidings of salvation through Christ. In this view every official and every worker in the Church, from the theological professor to the Sunday-school teacher and distributor of tracts, is an evangelist. Such were the apostles and others of their time.

But evangelists are mentioned in the New Testament as belonging to a distinct order of the Christian ministry. St. Paul (Eph. 4:11) affirms that Christ in glory, as Head of the Church, appointed some to be evangelists. That alone settles the question as to the existence of the order—a distinct class of men appointed to a special work in the Church and in the great harvest-field of the world.

But there seems to be no evidence that evangelists, as such, were set apart to their appointed work by the laying on of hands. Not that they were unordained men, but that the office of evangelist was very probably included in the diaconate and presbyterate. A notable instance of this is presented in the case of Philip, one of the first deacons. He was an ordained evangelist, though he was not ordained as such, but as a deacon. Having the qualifications of an evangelist, he labored in that line of work, and performed such ministerial functions as were proper for one of his order. He preached, and administered baptism, and no doubt some other deacons did the same. His work in Samaria shows the nature and importance of the evan-

gelist's office. He laid the foundation and prepared the way for a Christian congregation, to be fully established and equipped by others of higher authority coming after. This was done by the apostles Peter and John, who confirmed the baptized new disciples by prayer and the laying on of hands, and so completed the work begun by the evangelist. Afterwards we find Philip in South Palestine seated in the chariot of an Egyptian nobleman expounding to him the gospel, then baptizing him and sending him on his way rejoicing. Thus he engaged in Christian work that did not necessarily and palpably belong to the office of deacon. At the same time, the diaconate, even as to its original idea, has in it the very essence of evangelism; and while the deacon as such is not charged with the office of an evangelist, yet the early history of the diaconate shows plainly enough that it is an excellent fountain from which may spring forth evangelism in its best and healthiest form.

In the same way the local presbytery in the apostolic Church may have furnished evangelists, men endowed with the necessary gifts, who then would not restrict their labors of preaching and exhortation to a single community, but would go out, some at least, into other parts. Such men, whether deacons or elders, would have the great advantage that is conferred by ordination, having thus fixed upon them the seal of the Divine Spirit. They would be subject to the higher authority of the Church in general, and their work would be conducted under her direction; an important consideration surely when we consider what the Church is, the mystical body of Christ, who is the Head, and who would have the Church above all things obey heaven's first law, which is *order*. No one can read the New Testament with care without observing that unity and order in the Church were no less than what astronomers have discovered in the stellar heavens. "The heavens declare the glory of God," and the sentiment applies equally to the spiritual realm in which the risen Christ lives and reigns. That there were here and there in the early Church self-constituted evangelists, under no ecclesiastical direction, may be admitted; but

there is abundant evidence that nothing of the kind was ever encouraged by the apostles. What hints we have of such, only show exceptions that prove the rule, and also the spirit of insubordination that has been manifest in church and state ever since the first disobedience in Paradise. The first synod at Jerusalem proves two things: first, that the Church, officially expressing the will of Christ, granted large personal freedom in non-essentials to her members; second, that her authority was not to be questioned, and that therefore independency could not be tolerated. Therefore, the ministry of the gospel in all its departments and methods should present a united front to the world, every part in its proper place performing its own office; no self-willed assumptions, no attempts at improvements, or changes by unauthorized persons, no assertion of individualism as against the wisdom of the whole Church. If that first synod was right in asserting its authority over all Christendom, then independency, either on the part of an individual member or a number forming a sect, must be wrong.

We cannot conceive then that the early evangelists, any of them, were unordained men. They were most likely all ordained, some as deacons and others as elders, and became evangelists by a divine call through the Church. If there were other church workers who held neither of these offices, and indeed we know that there were many such, male and female, they too were under authority; so that from the apostles down to the active laity, there was one grand system, which could indeed be disturbed, but not without sinning against Christ, by the restless and evil spirit of independency and schism. And yet there was no straight-jacket system, and no rigidity, cramping and fettering the individual worker in the Lord's vineyard, but a freedom such as no slave and no patriot ever dreamed of. Who ever acted with greater freedom than did Philip the deacon and evangelist? As we see him leading the mission work in Samaria, we might suppose he was entirely independent of any authority elsewhere, and would submit to none. His success was phenomenal, and seemed to give him full right to assert

himself. But no, the evangelist gracefully handed over his work to the two apostles, that they might complete it, the law-abiding and faithful evangelist going elsewhere to work again without hindrance, to be followed again by higher office and authority. Christ gave some to be evangelists, so we are told; and He gave them, as He gave others, each order to do specific work—and to what end? St. Paul tells us (Eph. iv. 12): "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ"—but read on to the end of v. 16, and be out forever with the miserable conceit and anti-Christian spirit of separatism and self-appointed evangelism.

Much of the evangelism of to-day and that of the apostolic age are as wide apart as the poles. What resemblance there may be only makes the caricature the more unsightly and repulsive. I shall not be understood now as uttering wholesale judgment against modern evangelism. That would be far worse than the evil I shall attempt to point out. That there is genuine evangelical work done by evangelists worthy of the name there can be no doubt. But I would note two things right here: the one is, that there is a wide-spread false sentiment on this subject, including the Church and her ordinances, and on the Christian religion itself; and the second is that, as a consequence, a class of so-called evangelists are tolerated, encouraged and applauded, who should receive no aid or comfort from the Christian public. St. John would make short work of such pretenders, one and all: "Receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed."

It will serve as an illustration of pseudo-evangelism to compare a class of temperance lecturers, who make temperance their trade and something else their principle. The cause, to which they seem to have devoted themselves in the spirit of true philanthropy, is so excellent and appeals so powerfully to moral sentiment, that many good people are unable to see that the cause of temperance in such hands suffers more loss than any gain that may be secured. The lecturer may rant like a madman against people who refuse to fall in with his peculiar views

and methods, and his denunciations are applauded to the echo. He inveighs against ministers, churches and church people, and uses language fit only for slums and gambling dens; but his subject is temperance, and good men and women of unbalanced minds take it all in as right and proper. It not unfrequently happens that the lecturer is a so-called reformed drunkard, and this kind are of all others the most popular, first, with the rabble, who like the variety of horrible tales of personal experience, flings at the churches, ridicule, and the whole performance; and, second, with the weak-minded good people, who seem to think that such a precious brand snatched from the burning fiery furnace of Prince Alcohol has a perfect right to say what he pleases. Even if the fellow should lapse into drunkenness, for variety (as has often happened), after receiving his pay for a week's service on the temperance platform, his patrons condone the error and put the whole blame on the other parties. They do not see the injury they are doing the cause of temperance. And this is an illustration of the spirit of false individualism and independency; of the tendency to insubordination and lawlessness; of the readiness to accept the irresponsible utterances of a ranter rather than the combined wisdom of the best thinking of all ages.

Very much of the same kind are quite too many of the would-be Christian evangelists of modern times. To a certain class of persons of glib tongues the field is exceedingly inviting. They are sharp enough to know that a large proportion of the religious public can easily be marshalled into line for a month's onslaught upon the works of the devil. They know too that a safe majority of the pastors will fall into line, either from choice or from fear, so that the only opposition left is just what they are come to fight against, just what they need, on which they have the opportunity now to expend their eloquence and efforts.

Let us take a brief survey of one of these evangelists and his work. It has been published in the town papers and in some of the pulpits that he is coming; preparations are begun for his reception and the proper inauguration of a revival on a grand

scale; enough of the local clergy are in it to give fair promise of success; and so the work begins, continues, and ends; the result being a host of conversions; half the saloons broken up; no more gambling dens; crowds going to church that seldom went before; prayer-meetings well attended, and a general air of piety where to a large extent there was manifest indifference and worldliness. Surely a glorious result. Yes—if it were permanent, or even if it continued long enough to really quicken the spirituality of the Christian part of the community to a better and purer Christian life and greater zeal in the Master's service. But what is the result as viewed a little later on? Let one example serve as the type of many others. One of the most remarkable efforts of this kind ever known was in one of our great cities. The number of converts was immense. The evangelist had his own way, a host of city pastors acting as his obedient lieutenants. A year later these same lieutenants, ordained ambassadors of Christ (their commander-in-chief being a layman), took an inventory of their stock secured by the mighty effort of a year ago—and the result of the investigation was, that there was no stock to be found. What had seemed to be a pentecostal outpouring turned out to be "a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." What had been seen, being quite visible and big at the time, proved to be of as little substance as the great mountain ranges of clouds that appear for a few hours and then vanish. Was that discovery a reminder to those clergy that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation?" that Christ did not compare His kingdom to a passing cloud, however large, but to a rock? that He did not instruct His servants to look for great visible results from "special efforts," but directed their attention to the plodding and patient farmer, preparing his ground and sowing the seed, not expecting results in a moment, but in time seeing the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear? "*For so is the kingdom of God.*"

Some of the evangelists whom I have had in mind thus far, are no doubt good and worthy men, and have talents and quali-

fications that, if well directed, might be of great service to the cause of Christ; but unfortunately by far the greater number of them do not seem to have anything like correct views of the nature and constitution of the Church, and as a consequence they have inadequate views of Christianity itself. They seem to be perfect strangers to St. Paul's view of the Church. So the sacraments they merely accept and use because it may be safer to do so than to reject them, and they can, at least, do no harm—especially if the *caveat* is kept posted conspicuously before the eyes of saints and sinners, *not to place any confidence in them*. So, not knowing St. Paul's teaching on the Church, they never could understand his practice as an evangelist. As such he was careful not to labor in places where other ministers had the care of souls. He did not imagine, eloquent and learned apostle that he was, that other ordained ministers of the gospel could not do the work well enough in the places where they were appointed to labor. He had no such conceit, and so he steadfastly refused to waste his precious time and talents doing work that could be sufficiently well done by others. Not so our modern evangelists. They are not in an humble and quiet way searching out waste places, or laboring in obscure fields under the direction of the Church and her Board of Missions. What does it pay? O, well, only five or six hundred a year, *and no glory*. They can do better than that. It is true, college and seminary graduates are laboring in such fields, on such meagre salaries, albeit it cost them several thousand dollars to prepare for their work; but these men, whose education cost them nothing, can make a snug fortune at the business, without being annoyed by authority over them, or by troublesome parishioners. Still more, revival sermons do not require hard study; or, if they do, the same sermons will answer, with variations, in all places. So, with a flourish of trumpets the evangelist enters a town, preaches his familiar sermons, and convinces quite too many people that he is far superior as a preacher to any of the pastors of the place. Then, when the excitement is at high tide, a collection is taken for the man, and

he receives from two hundred to five hundred dollars for a two weeks' service.

Here is one of the temptations to engage in work of this kind. A real evangelist, one who understands the true nature and mission of the Church, and earnestly desires to bring the light of salvation to men surrounded by spiritual darkness, will not presume to take charge for a single day or an hour of the spiritual interests of a Christian town or city. The evangelist's real work is to break ground, and not to go in where the ground is already broken, the Church fully organized, and all its machinery in place and in motion. Of all frauds none appear so impudent and barefaced as this. The self-appointed evangelist, going to a place where well-equipped churches are on every hand, presumes that the work there has lacked in efficiency, and has not been successful. How has he come to know that? It may be answered, that some of the local pastors united in a Macedonian call to him to come and help them wake up the people and convert sinners; that they informed him of the low state of religion in their town; so he knows it, or believes it on the most competent authority. But so much the worse for those pastors. If they are not able to do their own work, after the Church has done so much to prepare them for it, and after the experience they have already had, then they would better step down and out, and let men take their places who boast that they are not ordained ministers, but were called directly by the Lord. If such men are good for a few weeks, and can do more in that time than regular pastors can in many years, why not at once fill up the ranks of the Lord's army of workers with men of that kind, and so relieve the Church of immense financial burdens? Why not have the benefit of such sons of thunder all the time? The answer is easy enough: *it wouldn't pay*. It would save the Church the harrowing appeals for beneficiary contributions; but the preachers themselves would not then pick up several hundred dollars a week for their services. That can be done only when there is a boom; and one of the entities in the evangelist's storehouse of knowledge is, knowing when the

iron is hottest, or the boom near the bursting point, and the right time then to rake in the dollars. In fact, the whole business, as now extensively carried on, is a miserable travesty of the Christian ministry, a contradiction of apostolic example and practice, contrary to good common sense, and condemned by its own legitimate fruits.

There is a class of evangelists in our country, of which the names of several are in my mind, that would be severely ignored here, were it not that many good people *run after them* as boys after an organ-grinder. They draw immense crowds, and by their buffoonery, slang, brow-beating, and wicked slandering of public men, whose shoes they are not worthy to bear, bring down the house with hilarious applause.

Of course they give variety to their performances by interjecting pious whining and cant, and by making some wholesome appeals to saints and sinners; and on this account, no doubt, many Christian people overlook what would ordinarily have seemed to them as unpardonable offences. And what does all this prove? Beyond question, that much of our modern Christianity is miserably out of harmony with the historical Church—the Church of the apostles and of the œcumenical creeds. The kind of religion fostered by such irregular, unseemly and grotesque means is unsacramental, legalistic (or the very opposite), and emotional. It is, besides, essentially the religion of fear; salvation is taken to mean so nearly only escape from perdition after death, that deliverance from sin, the blessedness and excellence of being in right relations with God through union with Christ is regarded, if at all, as a secondary matter. The great importance of religion as man's chief concern is diligently and dramatically set forth, and nervous appeals are made to the crowds to "embrace" it without a moment's delay, the danger of which is illustrated in all sorts of ways well calculated to alarm the impenitent and induce them to make instant efforts to be saved.

How different is all that from the ancient and historical procedure and church system, in which the catechumens were not

learners of a night or two, under the influence of a religious galvanic battery, that has wrought unnaturally in modern times upon the nerves rather than upon the heart and soul! The catechumen in the historical Church is indeed early taught that he is in a state of misery; but, at the same time, that God, in whom he lives and has his being, justly demands perfect obedience, and will accept his repentance and faith in Christ, in lieu of what he cannot render, and the holy life and works of charity which are the fruits of true faith. He is taught that salvation is release from the bondage of sin; that it is a life of holiness, and needed as well here throughout the whole period of this life as at the hour of death; that religion is not a disagreeable medicine which prudence urges one to take in order to escape what is infinitely worse than the nauseating remedy, *religion*; but, that the conditions of salvation are themselves of the nature of salvation, just as eternal punishment is of the nature of that which caused it.

It is not difficult to see, then, the cause of the usually early collapse of the far-famed work of the modern evangelist. Fear only lasts as long as the thing to be dreaded is in sight; and that is precisely the duration of the religion of fear. True Christian instruction, imparted by pastors thoroughly qualified to impart it, is a work that neither begins nor ends with *observation*, but is all the more thorough and enduring for that reason. This is the work of a pastor, so much discounted at the present time—a natural result of the pernicious use of false evangelism.

But what of the evangelists that Christ appointed as mentioned by St. Paul? Is there no place in the modern Church for that class of Christian laborers? Certainly there are places almost without number for the kind we have been considering, and just where they are least needed. Then it would seem as if true evangelical work could be done by evangelists under the direction and authority of the Church, as in the days of the apostles. Under the presbyterial form of church government, why should not elders and deacons, with the proper qualifica-

tions, labor as evangelists? Not all, of course, but such as may be found specially adapted to the work? This would mean, that there are places in which they could profitably exercise their gifts and talents. It implies that such service is needed. It may be said that all new fields are occupied by evangelists, though they are regularly ordained ministers—therefore bishops—and generally college and seminary graduates. But it is a fair question whether such pastoral fields, or many of them, could not be worked successfully, for a time, by elders or deacons specially fitted and appointed by ecclesiastical authority. Take, for example, a rural community where there are a half-dozen families of our church. They cannot support a regular pastor, nor can the Church afford to send them a missionary at an expense of four or five hundred dollars annually, when the money is so much needed elsewhere, where greater interests are at stake. How then can those people be saved to the Church, and themselves and others through them be spiritually benefited? The problem can be solved: they can contribute at least fifty dollars toward an appropriation of one hundred dollars by the Mission Board, *for the support of an evangelist*—to reside among them, engaging in the farming, mercantile, teaching, or other business, and therefore not in need of more than a merely nominal salary. Of course he must be the right man for such work. The average elder or deacon would prove a dismal failure. But there are many who are far above the average. We have elders and deacons, not a few, who are to-day equal in all essential respects to the pastors under whom they serve. Such could do the work that we are considering. But is it likely that in the supposed colony of a half-dozen families one such could be found? Not likely, at all. Then what? A training school for young men, business men, farmers, mechanics, and school teachers, in which for one year, or more in some cases, they shall be taught the essential doctrines of Christianity as presented in the catechism, the distinctive doctrines, customs and constitution of our truly Catholic Reformed Church, the English Bible, and a few other essential studies, and no one to be admitted into such

school for evangelists unless he is in possession of a good and solid common-school education. Having that, a year's instruction in the essentials of a theological course would make a good evangelist of a man that is godly, zealous, and anxious to labor in the Lord's vineyard. Suppose one such is willing to settle down in the midst of the little colony and there engage in business and in evangelistic work. His living not being dependent on a salary, he is paid one hundred dollars by his employer, the Board of Missions. He gathers the people together, holds services in school or private houses, at first, and as soon as possible has an inexpensive chapel erected; his authority as an ordained evangelist deacon is recognized by all concerned, and the work goes on decently and in order. During the year the people raise one-half of the appropriation; the next year they raise it all. The evangelist preaches, administers baptism (just what Philip did), catechises, superintends the Sunday-school, prepares persons for confirmation—but, of course, does not confirm, as that is a function of a regular minister or bishop. So, whether the evangelist be a deacon or an elder, he cannot perform ordination, as that is pre-eminently an episcopal function. The work is under the general direction of the Missionary Superintendent, who at stated times visits the colony or deposes some one to do it, who then confirms approved applicants for full church membership, and administers the Lord's Supper. This would mean that in due time the Christian colony would be organized into a congregation, requiring elders and deacons—a consistory. Then the deacon evangelist should be ordained an elder, who would be president of the consistory, the chief pastor and teacher. There would be in this nothing at all contrary to the presbyterian system of church government. Here then a congregation would be organized, equipped, and fostered at very little expense to the Church at large, an interest that, as often happens, might have been scattered and lost but for the agency employed. In the course of time other congregations would be formed in the same way in adjoining sections of country, and a regular and self-support-

ing pastoral charge constituted, with a pastor bishop at its head, one liberally educated at college and seminary. The evangelists, if not removing, would then be efficient helpers to the pastor, such helpers as are not often found in churches. But, if this system were established, it would often happen, no doubt, that such evangelists would remove to other places and engage with increased efficiency in gospel work.

Would such a plan operate against thorough collegiate and theological education? There is at least one who believes just the contrary, and his belief, for himself, amounts to certainty. The partially-educated evangelists would be just so many John the Baptists or Philips, preparing the way and breaking the ground for the men who graduate from our higher institutions of learning. The plan in successful operation would greatly increase the demand for them, and this, in turn, would swell the number preparing for the ministry. It would make things lively in our colleges and seminaries, and it would increase the demand for more room and more professors. We may well ask, Why should not an inferior order of clergy be put at work which they can do as well as any others; or, if not as well, at least well enough, especially in view of something better, for which this is the preparation?

Now, right here let us inquire what may be the matter with our mission work in certain cities, where we think our Church ought by all means to be established. Here, for instance, in a city where we ought to have fifty churches, there is one struggling English mission, strong only in its lungs, about which there can be no mistake (it will never die of pulmonary trouble), for its voice can be heard all over the land calling for help. And why is not the help forthcoming? Chiefly because of the large number of rural missions that drain the mission treasury—missions that could be provided for as suggested, without drawing away the funds and scattering them. With an inexpensive system of evangelism, the bulk of our mission funds could be used for Chicago and other cities, where, within a decade, strong and vigorous churches would be the result, and

would become so strong that other Reformed churches in the same city would swarm from them, just as has been the case in the cities of Reading and Allentown, and some other places *not* too numerous to mention. According to the method here proposed, and on strictly Scriptural lines, the advantages would be twofold: the demands of both city and country would be met. How is it now? Two examples for illustration will suffice, and they will indicate the contents of the rest of the volume. An active deacon, with a large and interesting family, settles down on a farm in Nebraska. He finds in the neighborhood enough Reformed people to organize a church, and others ready to join them. He corresponds with the proper authorities, appeals, prays, begs, that the interest be looked after, all without result, except failure; so that at last he is obliged to find a spiritual home in another denomination. That man is to-day a highly honored member of the church that received him from us, an elder and commissioner to its next General Assembly. Had he or some one else been appointed a temporary guardian and shepherd of that little flock, there is evidence to prove that there would be now in that place a flourishing congregation.

The other example is adduced to show how the maintenance of rural missions affects the work in large towns and cities. Under the present system the Board of Missions pays five hundred dollars annually to sustain a certain interest in the country. It is well worthy of such help; but it is so situated that a local evangelist could serve it acceptably, and in that way four hundred dollars could be saved and applied to some promising city mission. The one would not suffer loss, and the other would gain. If ten such rural missions were conducted on this plan, four thousand dollars would be the gain, which, if applied annually to the building up of the city mission until it would occupy its own beautiful temple, and be self-supporting, would be found to be one of the best-paying investments. As it is, however, the city mission goes begging. This would not be, if the old apostolic idea of evangelism were practiced now, which means a proper division of labor in the Church.

There may be offered as an objection to such scheme that it would tend to the lowering of the Christian ministry. This might be so, if the evangelists would be placed on a level with the regular ministry and clothed with episcopal powers. But that is not in the scheme at all, as they can be only deacons or elders, and, besides, should always be under the authority of the Board of Missions. They would constitute a subordinate, though very important, arm of the Church; and we might as well, therefore, object to Sunday-school superintendents taking the active and very responsible part they do in church work. But the superintendent is taken for just what he is, neither more nor less; and so in the case of the evangelist it would be the same. The people have more discrimination than we are wont to give them credit for. Who would say that the local preachers in the Methodist Church are a menace to the dignity and reputation of the higher clergy? Yet the scheme here presented has very little in common with the local ministry in the M. E. Church, and is free from what is most objectionable in that system.

I anticipate another objection: That some of these evangelists would fall into the conceit that they ought to be bishops, without further preparation, and that they would be encouraged in this by others. Quite likely such cases would occur, just as other evils and mischiefs occur, in every department of church work, that require the assertion of authority by the spiritual powers that be. That is all there is of it. So other objections might be brought against an evangelistic scheme like this; but I do not believe that any are valid, or even plausible. There is only one more that I think is worthy of attention, namely, that such local evangelists being engaged, usually, in some secular business, would be in constant danger of besmirching religion with secularism. No, never, unless the man is a religious pretender, in which case his devious course in business will reveal his true character and subject him to ecclesiastical trial and discipline. Away with the sentiment that religion is one thing and secular business quite something else. On the contrary

there is no better gauge of a man's religion than his conduct of worldly affairs. Then, too, it would be well understood that such arrangement is but temporary, and that the full pastorate means as complete separation as possible from the cares of things temporal. Any community could be made to understand this in five minutes.

Would not this be a most effectual means of elevating the standard of the local diaconate and presbyterate? Here would be one of them to show by precept and example that there is more meaning in those offices than has been commonly supposed.

Here is a plan—very crudely outlined, I am painfully aware—to utilize the talent of the Church at the least possible expense; not to save the people's money, except to put it to the best uses, where it can do the most good (as politicians say, though not as they *do*), where the results will be in proportion to the outlay, in growing towns and cities, that will in turn become sources of rich supply and pecuniary aid in mission work.

We may see also another great advantage here. The people served by one who like themselves is in business and not dependent on a salary, might, some of them, feel indifferent about contributing to make up the one hundred dollars, or whatever it might be. But the incumbent in this case asks not for himself, but for the cause of missions. He tells the people that they are under moral obligation to contribute a certain amount, and as much more as they can to further the work; that he himself is in the employ of the Board of Missions, and looks to it for what little compensation he is to receive. In fact, of all ministers of the gospel he is the most independent and free in this respect, and can thus indirectly raise his own salary without the nerve-racking fear (which most of us have experienced) of being regarded as mercenary and self-seeking.

The Reformed Church, it may be confidently asserted, will never be induced to seek the aid of evangelistic meteors, great or small. Up in the air meteors may serve a good purpose; but here on terra firma the Reformed Church at least has no use for them. Her idea of the Church and ministry and of the

nature of Christianity forbids anything of the kind. But she has a ministry consisting of three distinct orders, and she ought not to rest satisfied with what has been a fact, whatever the theory, that only one of these orders has ever performed a part at all commensurate with the powers and authority conferred in the ordination of elders and deacons. The office for inducting men into these orders is truly Scriptural, but practically it is a form with little corresponding substance, the happy exceptions only serving to magnify the practical defects.

Here it was my intention to stop; but a thought has occurred to me on this subject which I feel urged to express. Would it not be a most excellent thing if young men preparing for evangelistic work would make *teaching* their profession? By taking a full course at a normal school, and the prescribed course for evangelists, they would stand a first-class chance of appointment as public-school teachers just where their services would be needed as evangelist deacons or elders. They would be exerting a double influence for good in the community. The school would be, of course, non-sectarian, but not any the less Christian on that account, and the little flock of Christian people would not be deprived of a shepherd. Would not this go far in solving the moral and religious problem in popular education, as well as the rural mission problem? The deacon, or elder, would have plenty of time during the long vacations to attend to pastoral work; and during the sessions of the school he would be constantly increasing his mental stock and his ability to do the work of an evangelist. It would seem that this particular feature of the proposed scheme ought alone to commend it to the Church for consideration and action.

#### IV.

### "LUTHERANISM AND THE REAL PRESENCE."

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, D.D.

IN the August No. of the *Magazine of Christian Literature* appeared a short notice referring to an article in the *Homiletical Review* from the pen of the Rev. J. B. Riemensnyder, D.D., of New York, with the above caption, in which it is said that he roundly affirmed the old Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation. He says: "The Real Presence is the peerless jewel of the *Evangelical Lutheran Church*." The matter of which his article treats is interesting both *doctrinally* and *historically*. In our day, we are told that "Union is in the air," and, therefore, it will be well to understand clearly the denominational positions, especially theologically, that, amid the vast amount of rubbish, we may know what will be worth saving and what should go overboard.

In that article it is said: "By thus standing immutably for the teaching of Scripture and the faith of ancient and universal Christendom, Luther averted the gravest danger of the Reformation, and swung it into the safe channel of conservatism." Again: "While other churches are in life-and-death struggle to preserve the Christian foundations, the Lutheran Church, with these long settled, peaceably addresses itself to the development of the noblest trees of orthodox evangelical theology, and to the culture of the richest fruits of practical piety." This the Rev. R. allows himself to write in the face of some seventeen different phases or divisions in the Lutheran denomination, as reported in *The Voice*, ranging from the lowest, baldest view of the Sacraments, all the way to that akin with Transubstantiation. Is it not true that, in that very body, there are parties,

unchurching others of the same name, but not of the same mind, and under no circumstances will fellowship with such? There seems to be little to bind together these different divisions in the counting of numbers which is done but the talismanic name of Martin Luther. "All schools of Lutheran divines appeal to his authority: the extreme orthodox, who out-Luther Luther in devotion to the letter: the moderate or middle party, who adhere only to the substance of his teaching; and the rationalists, who reject his creed, but regard him as the standard-bearer of the freedom of private judgment and dissent from all authority." (Schaff's Ch. Hist., Vol. VI., p. 731.)

Prof. Ad. Harnack (Martin Luther, Giessen, 1883, p. 4) well says: "Fast jede Partei unter uns hat ihren Luther und meint den wahren zu haben. Die Verehrung für Luther vereinigt mehr als die Hälfte unserer Nation und die Auffassung Luther's trennt sie." (Note, same page.)

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, two leaders appear—Luther in Germany and Zwingli in Switzerland,—who commenced a reformation in the Church much needed, and earnestly desired even by some of the pious and God-fearing men in the Romish Church. They were led to the work independently of each other, about the same time, and from different convictions, each one occupying a different standpoint. This is summed up thus: "Away with legal bondage and work righteousness," was Luther's cry. "Away with idolatry and moral corruption," was the motto of Zwingli, Farel, Calvin and Knox. Both aimed at reforming abuses and eliminating corruptions then existing. Agreeing on many points of doctrine, it is said, "that at the conference held in Marburg, Luther and Zwingli agreed in fourteen and a half Articles, and differed only in the other half of the Fifteenth Article concerning the Real Presence." (Schaff's Creeds, etc., p. 212.) Much had been written, and from now on more, on both sides, and in the Article referred to, it is said, "Calvin, who largely agreed with Luther, termed the Zwinglian view 'profane.'" But, in fairness to Zwingli, much misunderstood and misrepresented (his time is coming), his view, which

Calvin so characterized, was directed against and stood opposed to the idea of the Romish Mass, which affirmed a daily offering or sacrifice, and his view, or statement, therefore, was made to partake more of the negative. That, no doubt, led him to speak of the Sacrament as commemorative, without affirming the positive side; and it is evident that the low, bald view, often attributed to Zwingli, *was not his* view, as will further on appear.

What now is the history as set forth by Dr. Riemensnyder? One thing is certain, viz: that the generally accepted view of the Lord's Supper, as now held by the largest portion of the Lutheran Church, is not that of Luther, but is clearly the Calvinistic, partaking even more of the Zwinglian than that of Luther. At the diet of Augsburg, June 25, 1530, a Confession was read, drawn up by Melancthon, which was not simply a Lutheran protest, but the protest of Protestantism, setting forth facts and doctrines which were pressing for a solution. Among other articles the Tenth, on the Lord's Supper, reads thus: "Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the (true) body and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of bread and wine), and are (there) communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper (and received). And they disapprove of those that teach otherwise (wherefore all the opposite doctrine is rejected)." This statement, it is said, was satisfactory to the Romanist. Already the Confession of Augsburg expresses itself, though indefinitely enough, yet still in a manner to enable Catholics to declare themselves tolerably satisfied with it. The "Apology" is still more explicit, for, in a few brief words, it says, that a sacrament is a ceremony, or work instituted by God, wherein that is represented to us, which the grace annexed to the ceremony proffers. (*Moehler's Symbolism*, p. 284.) At the same time, July 11th, another Confession, known as the "Tetrapolitan," hastily drawn up by Bucer, in the name of the four cities, was submitted, but unfortunately was denied a hearing: "It consisted of twenty-three chapters, besides the Preface and Conclusion. In the Eighteenth Chapter the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is couched in dubious language,

which was intended to comprehend, in substance, the Lutheran and Zwinglian theories, and contains the germ of the view afterwards more clearly and fully developed by Calvin." "In this ordinance, it is said, Christ offers to his followers, as truly now as at the institution, His very body and blood as spiritual food and drink, whereby their souls are nourished to everlasting life" (Schaff's Creeds, etc.). This shows that at that day already two tendencies were present and striving for recognition. Melancthon, the author of the Confession, always willing to compromise and reconcile differences, saw fit, in 1540, to alter the Tenth Article, so as to read, "Concerning the Supper of the Lord they teach that with bread and wine are truly exhibited the body and blood of Christ to those that eat in the Lord's Supper." At first little account was kept of this change, until Dr. Eck directed attention to it, and then the theological war opened afresh. It is admitted by Zöckler that the Tenth Article is *Calviniserend* and *Bucerianisirend*, in the sense of the Wittenberg Concordia of 1536, whereby Bucer, with Melancthon's express coöperation and the subsequent consent of Calvin, endeavored to unite the Lutheran and the Swiss." As the controversy was carried on and the doctrine developed, it finally found expression in the "Formula of Concord," where it is clearly stated as follows: "Article Seventh. We believe, teach and confess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine. . . . Not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth, nevertheless, not capernaitically, but after a spiritual and heavenly manner, by reason of the sacramental union." "It (Article Seventh) sets forth clearly and fully the doctrine of Consubstantiation (as it is usually called in distinction from the Romish Transubstantiation), i. e., of the co-existence of two distinct yet inseparable substances in the Sacrament. It is the doctrine of the *real and substantial presence* of the body and blood of Christ, *in, with, and under* the elements of bread and wine (*in cum et sub pane et vino*), and the oral manducation of

both substances by *unbelieving* as well as believing communicants, though with opposite effects . . . the notion of a capernaïtic or physical eating with the teeth is indignantly rejected as a malignant and blasphemous slander of the sacramentarians," "and yet Luther himself unequivocally taught the literal *mastication* of Christ's body. He gave it as the sum of his belief, to which he would adhere though the world should collapse, that Christ's body was *ausgetheilt, gegessen und mit den zähnen zerbissen*" (Briefe Ed. by De Wette, vol. iv., p. 572). (See Prof. Kurtz, Ch. His., vol. ii., p. 270.) He instructed Melancthon to insist on this in the conference he had with Bucer in Cassel, December, 1534; but Melancthon, though not emancipated from Luther's view at that time, declined to shoulder it as his own, and began to change his ground on the Eucharistic question. (Corp. Ref., vol. ii., p. 822; Ebrard, Abendmahl, vol. ii., p. 375 et seq.) (Schaff's Creeds, etc., p. 317 and Note.) This, then, is the interpretation of Article Ten as given by Martin Luther himself. Of that there can be no mistake.

Let us now look at the altered Augsburg Confession of 1540. Zwingli had been characterized as a rationalist. Rev. R. affirmed in his article, "that in Zwingli he (Luther) was face to face with the modern rationalistic tendency." Accepting this, it is surprisingly strange that the large mass of Lutheran Churches then, and even some of the universities, were thus brought under Zwinglian influences and wrought the reign of rationalism in the very country where Luther's reformation started and developed, which, to say the least, is not credible. Luther at one time regarded Zwingli an *un-Christ* (heathen), but after becoming better acquainted with him, as at Marburg, though he refused Zwingli his hand, in a letter to Bullinger, 1538, "he found that the Swiss were not such bad people as he had imagined, and that Zwingli impressed him at Marburg as a *very good man (optimus vir)*. Jonas described the Reformed leaders, 'all learned men,' and Zwingli seems well versed in letters."

In the Tetrapolitan Confession, that of the four cities, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, ch. xviii., is said to be couched

in dubious language, perhaps for a purpose. In the Confession Zwingli sent to King Francis I., his last word on the subject of the Eucharist, you read this: "We believe that *Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper*, yea, that there is no communion without such presence . . . We believe that *the true body of Christ is eaten in the Communion*. Not in a gross and carnal manner, but in a sacramental and spiritual manner, by the religious, believing, and pious heart." "This passage comes so near the Calvinistic view that it can hardly be distinguished from it." Would Calvin call that profane? Is Zwingli thus a rationalist, as often charged? Had he lived and developed his theory, it is altogether probable that it would have been in full accord with that of Melancthon and Calvin. *Dorner*, in *His. Prot. Theol.*, Vol. I., p. 308, says: "When he (Zwingli) calls the Supper sometimes the body and blood of Christ, and sometimes, and more frequently, the remembrance of the death of Christ and of all the benefits which it confers on us, the inference is not to be drawn from that circumstance, any more than from the word 'Eucharist' of the early Church, that he considered the essence of the Supper to be the remembrance as a subjective performance. His only concern is to set aside in this way the idea of a sacrifice of the mass as a constantly repeated sacrifice of Christ, and to excite to the appropriation of that sacrifice, which happened once, and avails forever, by means of the reminiscence of grace-receiving faith. That he thinks of *Christ as present is undeniable*: He was at this feast, host and banquet food ('*hospes et epulum*')."

In the theory of Luther we have his statement of the doctrine as that of *Consubstantiation*, carrying with it the doctrine of the *Ubiquity of the Body of Christ*, both of which Melancthon, Calvin and Zwingli repudiated and in opposition they affirmed the spiritual real-presence, mediated by the power of the Holy Ghost. We offer no criticism on the theory, but simply to present a clear and true statement. The view of Melancthon, Calvin and Zwingli differs widely from that of Luther as given by himself, and the Lutheran theory, as now held, is more in accord with

the altered Confession of 1540, and the Reformed. This too, is the form in which the doctrine is held by the largest portion of the Lutheran Church and the theory of Consubstantiation and the Ubiquity of the Body of Christ, fundamental in the Lutheran Church holding the Confession of 1580, and as interpreted by Luther himself, is repudiated and is not held. Dr. Wolf, professor in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., in a tract entitled "The Lutherans," says, "The Sacraments, which in common with others they hold to be signs and memorials, Lutherans regard also as vehicles and bearers of invisible energy, through which the ascended Redeemer touches the individual soul, enduing it in baptism with the beginning of a new life and nourishing it in the Supper by the Communion of His body and blood." "Lutherans hold that the bread remains bread, the wine remains wine, but in the sacramental reception of these there is a unique reception of the Lord Jesus Christ, a communion of His body and blood." This is genuine Reformed doctrine, but unfortunately not that of Luther, as he stated it himself and on which he insisted.

Let us now place them side by side and see.

ARTICLE X. AUGS. CON.  
LUTHER'S "SUMMA."

DR. WOLF.

ZWINGLI'S CON.

REFORMED—HEID. CAT.

"The body of Christ is truly eaten in and with the bread, so that what the bread effects and suffers: thus it is distributed, masticated and swallowed" *Ausgetheilt, gegeben und mit den zihnen zerbiessen.*

The bread remains bread, the wine remains wine, but in the sacramental reception of the body of Christ is a unique reception of the Lord Jesus Christ, a communion of His body and blood.

(As above.)

We believe that Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper. . . . that the body of Christ is eaten in the Communion in a sacramental and spiritual manner.

(As above.)

Questions 75, 76, 79,—that he feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life, with His crucified body and shed blood, etc., . . . but also to become more and more united to His sacred body, by the Holy Ghost, . . . so His crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink whereby our souls are fed to eternal life, etc., etc.

Let any one compare these statements and judge for himself. Is it not clear that the doctrine as now held differs widely from that of Luther, and does not Dr. Wolf, with the largest portion of his church fall in, hold and teach what in germ was at hand in the Te-

trapolitan Confession, and, after ten years, appeared in the altered Confession of 1540, which, developed more fully by Calvin, found expression in the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, and which theory of the doctrine is, in this day, accepted by that large reformed portion of Protestantism, as the Confessions of these various branches amply teach. Had Zwingli lived there can be no question he would have developed his view, as it was in germ already in his Confession to King Francis I., and would have been in full accord with that of Calvin. On several important points in theology he stood far in advance of his time, towards which the thought of the Protestant world is gradually coming. The truth is, Zwingli's time is coming. Furthermore, it is not to be questioned that, had Luther and his theologians expressed themselves at Marburg, and during that long-continued controversy, as Lutheran theologians are now doing, there would have been no occasion for a divided Protestantism. Then it was different as Rev. R. declares in his Article, from what we now have. Then it was Consubstantiation, *in, with and under* with the doctrine of the *Ubiquity of the Body of Christ*, now it is the *Spiritual real*, as in the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563.

As the case now stands there is hope, perhaps in the far future, of a united Evangelical Protestant Church, seeing that the largest portion of the Protestant world, all the reformed bodies, as the Presbyterian, Congregational with the Episcopal, Methodist and the largest portion of the Lutheran Church make common with this much-discussed and much and often misrepresented doctrine, as their Catechisms, Confessions and teaching show, and in this way are reaching out towards the goal ardently longed and prayed for, "that they all may be one."

## V.

### PITTSBURG SYNOD—ITS TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY.

BY REV. A. E. TRUXAL, D. D.

#### INTRODUCTION.

THE hidden forces operative in human society are many and various. They may be likened unto subterranean water-courses, large and small, that flow in all directions underneath our feet, whose existence and location are revealed to us only by the well-drillers' shaft that pierces them and by the many springs on the hill-side and in the valley from which flows the water that forms our rills and rivers and feeds our lakes and seas. Were the water-veins of the earth to become empty, the fountains and rivers would soon dry up and the ocean be deprived of its necessary supply of fresh water.

Society is a bed of humanity underneath the surface of which are at work all the time invisible forces, whose existence and strength are known only by the various results produced by them from time to time. And were society in some way robbed of these inherent spiritual forces, it would soon reach a state of stagnation. But to discern these living powers, and accurately trace them to but a limited extent, requires faculties of apprehension of a peculiar kind and superior order. And yet, almost any one can feel the existence of these forces operative in the various affairs of men, and the study of no subject is more replete with interest and a more fruitful source of edification, than the contemplation of the silent influences and forces at work in the complex organization of human society.

Nothing exerts an influence so powerful, among the fundamental elements of society, as the religion of the people. And

no religion is so mighty in controlling and moulding the life of the people, in all its various manifestations, as our holy Christianity represented by the Church of the living God.

It can consequently not be otherwise but that every advance movement of the Church, every betterment in the form of organization, and every new mode of operation, puts into activity new forces that may perchance sooner or later exhaust themselves and pass away, though not without having effected some results, or that may accumulate strength as the years roll on, being productive of good until lost in the ages of the world to come.

When the Classes east of the State of Ohio and west of the Alleghany mountains were a quarter of a century ago formed into a synodical organization of their own, there were set in motion religious forces whose good results already accomplished it is impossible for any one to appreciate fully at this time; and of whose accomplishments in the future for the welfare of man, no mind, however great its power of prophetic vision, is able to form an adequate conception.

As Pittsburg Synod has held its twenty-fifth annual sessions, it becomes the duty of the members thereof to stop a moment in the midst of their present labors and cares, and look upon their past history with the view of realizing what they once were as an ecclesiastical body and what they now are; of beholding what by the favor of the Lord they were enabled to effect, and what they failed to accomplish; of thanking the Lord for His great grace and rich blessings already bestowed upon them; of penitently praying for His forgiving mercy; and of invoking upon themselves a larger measure of the divine Spirit, in order that they may be more faithful in the future and accomplish still greater results for the Master than they have ever done in the past.

#### PRELIMINARY STEPS.

It is proper that a brief history of Pittsburg Synod should at this time be put on record. We will, therefore, first of all,

trace the preliminary actions which led to the formation of this Synod.

At the annual meeting of the Westmoreland Classis in 1865, "The following preamble and resolution were adopted :"

"Whereas, The geographical boundaries of the Westmoreland Classis lie altogether in the State of Pennsylvania; and,

"Whereas, The expenses incurred in sending delegates to Synod are so great, owing to the distances; therefore,

"Resolved, That this Classis respectfully petition the Synod of Ohio and adjacent States to dismiss her to the Eastern Synod."

A strong reason for this action, not expressed but well understood by both Classis and Synod, was the fact that the Classis was, at the time, not in harmony with the Synod on the various questions of theology and cultus by which the whole Church was then very much agitated. The Ohio Synod at its meeting in May, 1866, laid this petition of Westmoreland Classis on the table for one year.

By incidental conferences and private discussions on the part of the ministers of Western Pennsylvania, the thought gradually came to prevail that the right thing to be done was the organization of a new Synod. Westmoreland Classis, consequently, at its annual meeting held in Somerset, in 1866, adopted the following preamble and resolutions :

"Whereas, The several Classes embraced within the territory known as Western Pennsylvania and Western New York lie so far from the centres of our respective District Synods, so that the expenses incurred in sending delegates to Synod are usually very large; therefore,

"Resolved, That we respectfully ask General Synod to recommend the formation of the Classes of West New York, St. Paul's, Clarion, and Westmoreland, into a District Synod, to be known by the name of the Synod of Pittsburg.

"Resolved, That the officers of Classis be instructed to memorialize the General Synod with the above action."

The General Synod being in regular sessions a few months

later (November 1, 1866, at Dayton, Ohio), took favorable action on the above overture, authorizing the Classes interested to take the necessary constitutional steps "to secure their organization into a District Synod, to be known as the Pittsburg Synod."

The necessary preliminary steps were not taken without some hesitation on the part of West New York Classis. In 1867, in reply to a communication from the Westmoreland Classis on the subject of the new Synod, it passed this action: "*Resolved*, That West New York Classis prefers the formation of a German Synod of the East." In 1869, however, the Classis fell in with the movement. The Eastern Synod at first, also, hesitated to sanction the formation of the proposed Synod. In 1867 Clarion and St. Paul's Classes petitioned it for dismissals for the purpose of entering into the organization of Pittsburg Synod. This petition was referred back to the Classes by the Synod for reconsideration. This action is explained by the following facts:

The formation of a general body in 1863 out of the Eastern and Ohio Synods contemplated the division of these Synods, so that the District Synods would be smaller in size and more in number. Consequently, in 1865 the Eastern Synod submitted the question of dividing the body into two or more District Synods to its Classes. Six of the Classes voted negatively on the proposition and nine voted affirmatively, though some of them did so conditionally. The result showed that the Synod was far from being of one mind in regard to the matter. Further, it was felt by some members of the Eastern Synod, that because of the greatly disturbed condition of the Church by the liturgical and other questions, the General Synod had, perhaps, better be dissolved. At the meeting of the General Synod, in 1869, in Philadelphia, a motion was made to dissolve the body, and was defeated by only a small majority. It was thought that if the General Synod should be discontinued, then the Eastern Synod had better remain intact. This opinion, and the fact that the matter could come before that body in

1868 or 1869 again, before the General Synod could take final action in the case, caused the Eastern Synod in 1867 to send back for reconsideration the petition of Clarion and St. Paul's Classes for dismissal from its body.

Westmoreland Classis, at Berlin, in 1868, passed the following action:

"Whereas, the interests of the Reformed Church in Western Pennsylvania and Western New York imperatively demand that the several Classes comprised in said territory should be organized into a Synod; therefore be it, and it is hereby, resolved by this Classis:

"1st. That we request Synod, at its next annual meeting, to dismiss us for the purpose of uniting with the Clarion, St. Paul, and Western New York Classes of the Eastern Synod, in petitioning the General Synod at its next meeting to constitute the aforesaid Classes into the proposed Synod.

"2d. That we request the Classes of Clarion, St. Paul, and Western New York, respectively, to appoint a committee of three to confer with a similar committee from this body, with reference to taking the necessary preliminary steps towards securing the desired synodical organization at as early a day as possible.

"3d. That the committee from this body called for in the above resolution be appointed by us at the present meeting."

The committee appointed consisted of Revs. T. J. Barkley, F. K. Levan, and J. H. Wagner.

The following year, 1869, this committee reported to Classis, at Irwin, as follows:—

"The committee appointed at the last annual meeting to confer with similar committees from Clarion, St. Paul, and Western New York Classes, in regard to the formation of a District Synod, would report,—

"That we held a meeting in Pittsburg last May, and, after due consideration, it was resolved to lay the subject before the above-named Classes at their approaching annual meetings. Accordingly, Rev. F. K. Levan was appointed to visit Western

New York Classis, and in person present the subject to that body; and Rev. T. J. Barkley was instructed to address Clarion and St. Paul Classes by letter. All the Classes responded favorably by the appointment of the desired committees. A regular joint meeting of the committees thus appointed has not yet been held; but at two informal meetings the following points were agreed upon:

"1. That Revs. T. J. Barkley, J. B. Kniest, and William Landis be appointed to attend the meeting of the Eastern Synod, and secure the dismissal of Clarion, Western New York, and St. Paul Classes from the said Synod, for the purpose of uniting in the formation of the proposed District Synod.

"2. That all the committees of the several Classes directly interested sign a petition, praying the Eastern Synod to grant the above-mentioned Classes their dismissal for the purpose already stated.

"3. That the particular form in which the matter shall be laid before the General Synod be postponed until its meeting in November, when the committees can meet and perfect their arrangements."

The committee, as per above, presented a petition to the Eastern Synod, at Danville, in 1869, asking for the dismissal of the Classes belonging to it. After having canvassed the matter thoroughly, the Synod granted the request of the petitioners. The Ohio Synod, the same year, at its annual meeting, dismissed Westmoreland Classis. The General Synod, which met a few months later, was also properly overtured; it responded favorably by authorizing the organization of the new Synod, fixing February 11, 1870, as the time when, and Grace Church, Pittsburg, as the place where, the members of the several Classes should meet for organization, and appointing Dr. N. P. Hacke to preside at the preliminary organization. According to the final action of the General Synod, the responsibility of selecting a name for the new Synod was left with the body itself. Upon its organization, the Synod, after consider-

able deliberation, adopted the name originally suggested, namely, Pittsburg.

The leading facts and considerations that entered into the motive that constrained these Classes to seek a synodical organization for themselves, as seen by the foregoing, were the following:—*First*, the geographical position of these Classes, lying as they did between the Eastern and Ohio Synods, and the long distances to the usual meeting-places of these Synods; *second*, the want of proper theological and ecclesiastical harmony between one of the largest and most influential of these Classes with its Synod; and *third*, the special work which these Classes felt themselves called upon to perform in this portion of the Church. This last consideration constituted the most cogent reason of all. The ministers laboring in this section realized forcibly that the territory of Western Pennsylvania and Western New York was important missionary ground for the Reformed Church to occupy and develop. Opportunities and calls for organizing new congregations and strengthening old ones were seen and heard on all sides. To meet the requirements of the circumstances demanded the united efforts and co-operation of all the Classes. But such co-operative efforts could be efficiently made by the Classes only by the sympathetic and hearty support of a Synod of their own. Besides this, the Christian community in this portion of the country was, in those days, largely pervaded by an unchurchly and subjective type of Christianity; whereas, these Classes represented the Gospel in a more churchly, objective and positive form and manner. The Reformed Church was, consequently, placed on the defensive against the encroachments made upon her by other denominations, because of the different types of religion represented. In order to uphold the Christian cause, as represented by the Reformed Church, and become aggressive in religious work, these Classes needed a synodical organization in their own immediate midst, to encourage, support and strengthen them. We feel persuaded that Pittsburg Synod was organized in obedience to the Providence of God and to the promptings of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

## ITS ORGANIZATION.

In compliance with the action of General Synod the ministers and elders of the four Classes already mentioned met in Grace Church, Pittsburg, February 11th, 1870, at half-past seven o'clock, P. M., and were called to order by Dr. N. P. Hacke, who presided at the organization of the body. Divine services were conducted by the presiding officer, and Rev. D. B. Ernst, and at the President's request a sermon was preached by Rev. F. K. Levan on the text, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us." A permanent organization was then effected by the election of the following officers: President, Rev. F. K. Levan; Stated Clerk, Rev. W. E. Krebs; Corresponding Secretary, Rev. J. G. Shoemaker; and Treasurer, Elder W. E. Schmertz.

Of the ministers who took part in this meeting in 1870, only four are members of Synod at the present time: they are, J. G. Shoemaker, J. F. Wiant, Dr. A. J. Heller, and J. F. Snyder, the last, however, being the only one that has been a member uninterruptedly. Rev. James Grant was at this first meeting of Synod received into the ministry of the Reformed Church, and has been a member of the body ever since. The ministers who belonged to the several Classes at the time of the organization of Synod, though not present at the original meeting and who are now members of the body, are: B. Knepper, W. C. Houpt, Dr. C. R. Deiffenbacher, and Dr. W. Rupp. Of the ministers present at the organization the following have since died: Dr. N. P. Hacke, C. C. Russell, D. B. Ernst, F. Wise, D. O. Shoemaker, J. J. Pennepacker, J. Kretzing, L. B. Leasure, H. F. Keener, J. Rubl, and H. C. Heyser. Of the ministers on the classical roll as reported to the first annual meeting, the following have died: F. Wall, Phillip Zeiser, Abner Dale, D. D. Leberman, H. E. F. Foight, Dr. J. B. Kneist, Dr. D. Willers, and Charles Kuas. Of the ministers who took part in the original meeting of Synod the following are laboring in other portions of the Church: Dr. F. K. Levan,\*

\* Dr. Levan, who was the first president of Synod, has died since the late twenty-fifth annual meeting of Synod.

W. M. Landis, Prof. W. E. Krebs, E. H. Dieffenbacher, Dr. A. B. Koplin, Dr. T. J. Barkley, T. F. Stauffer, H. Bielsfeld, and Dr. J. H. Stepler.

Of the elders in attendance upon the sessions of the first meeting the following are still living: George Rearich, John Long, Bixley Beighley, W. G. King, Martin Sittler, Bartholomew Siedler, Samuel Berkley, Jacob Zunedel (?), S. C. Remsberg, John Wiegand, H. M. Stitzer, Hon. W. J. Baer, and John Gumbert.

The deceased are: Abraham Wyant, John Crick, Daniel Davis, D. S. Diffenbacher (afterwards a minister), T. J. Craig, Christian Siebert, W. E. Shinertz, Levi Kemp, and Joseph Cort.

Not including the statistics of West New York Classis and of the German ministers and congregations afterwards dismissed, Pittsburg Synod, at its first annual meeting, was composed of 38 ministers and 8295 members, and recorded \$5408.44 as the amount of the benevolent contributions during the year then closed.

The Presidents of Synod have been Revs. Dr. F. K. Levan, Dr. D. Willers, J. G. Shoemaker, Dr. W. Rupp, Dr. J. I. Swander, Dr. T. J. Barkley, Dr. C. R. Dieffenbacher (in 1875 and in 1893), J. W. Love, Dr. J. H. Apple, Dr. J. M. Titzel, Dr. A. E. Truxal, D. S. Diffenbacher, J. McConnell, F. Pilgram, Dr. D. B. Lady, C. U. Heilman, H. F. Keener, J. F. Snyder, Dr. S. Z. Beam, H. King, Dr. A. R. Kremer, J. F. Wiant, Dr. A. J. Heller, R. E. Bowling, and Dr. P. C. Prugh.

The following were Stated Clerks: Revs. Prof. W. E. Krebs, Dr. J. A. Hoffheins, H. F. Keener, Dr. J. M. Schick, and J. H. Mickley.

The Treasurers have been: Elders W. E. Schmertz, T. J. Craig, C. M. Bousch, R. C. Jamison, and Rev. Dr. A. J. Heller.

In 1871 the Synod, in response to petitions submitted, ordered a division of Westmoreland and St. Paul's Classes, so as to form two new Classes, viz., Somerset and Alleghany. In 1874 the Classis of West New York and some German pastors, with their congregations belonging to other Classes, were at their

own request dismissed for the purpose of entering into the organization of the German Synod of the East. Since then the Synod has been constituted of five Classes, as at present.

#### ORIGINAL ANIMUS OF THE BODY.

When Pittsburg Synod entered upon its career as an ecclesiastical body it was possessed of somewhat exaggerated ideas as to its immediate mission and responsibilities. The prevailing thought in the minds of its members was that it must at once secure for itself and operate all the agencies which belong to a well-established and strong synod. The zeal of its members ran at full height, and hence they were willing and ready to undertake almost anything in any line of church work. They had cut loose from the older Synods and felt themselves free of all restraint, and in their enthusiasm imagined that they would carry on the various interests of the Church in a new way and manner and with greater rapidity than the other Synods had done. And in many respects they succeeded too in improving upon the methods and activity of the older bodies, and the influence that went forth from their aggressive spirit and vigorous life was sensibly felt in other portions of the Church. Nevertheless as the years passed by they gradually came to realize that the work of the Gospel had to be done everywhere very much in the same way, and that the kingdom of God could nowhere be established by a hurrah and a rush. But Pittsburg Synod at its organization thought it saw in the near future under their management and control a college "for both males and females," perhaps a Theological Seminary and church paper of its own. At its very first meeting it appointed a committee of seven to take under consideration the "educational interests of this Synod" and to propose a plan for "getting up a literary institution." Rev. W. E. Krebs was chairman of this committee, which six months later at the first annual meeting submitted a favorable report which was adopted, and a Board of Trustees for the proposed institution was elected, consisting of Revs. W. E. Krebs, A. J. Heller, T. J. Barkley and F. K.

Levan, and Messrs. W. E. Schmertz, C. M. Bousch, Christian Siebert, B. Wolf, Jr., and W. J. Baer.

The college, however, for various reasons was never established. One of the considerations by which the Synod was moved to take action without delay in the matter was the belief that some rich men within its bounds could be persuaded to endow such an institution if it were established. But the persons Synod had in view declined to act in the desired direction—though some of them subsequently devised liberal things for the Church. At another time later on a feeble but unsuccessful effort was again made to establish such an institution. This time a president of the proposed college was elected; but the college never came.

Pittsburg Synod also at one time went into the publication business. It issued a church paper for several years. The paper was productive of good in this section of the Church during its existence; but it was in a short time absorbed into an older and larger publication.

These efforts on the part of Synod may be regarded as failures; and such they were. And yet they were not without their good results too. The Synod learned valuable lessons by these experiences; and further, the efforts put forth carried their reward with them in the form of a reflex influence upon the body and aided very much in bringing it to a clearer consciousness of its mission and work.

The main sphere, however, in which the Synod was especially active was the department of Home Missions. In head and members it was in the beginning and has been all along very zealous in the work of extending and enlarging the Church within its own borders. During its first years it employed a missionary superintendent of its own, who devoted his whole time to mission work within its territory. Later on it united with the two Synods east of the mountains in carrying on the cause of Home Missions. The first missionary superintendent under the Tri-synodic arrangement was taken from Pittsburg Synod in the person of Dr. Levan. At the present time this

cause is conducted by the General Synod's Board of Home Missions with which this Synod is co-operating.

Pittsburg Synod is at present associated with the Potomac and Eastern Synods in the interests of publication, collegiate and theological education, possessing legal rights and having share in the management of the publications at Philadelphia, Franklin and Marshall College, and the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa.

As it seems to the writer this Synod has never yet made real earnest with higher education within its own midst. Perhaps there was at no time yet a strong call or favorable opportunity for it to do so. But the cause of higher education of the young people, male and female, of the Synod ought not to be forgotten or ignored. It seems to us that the time has now fully arrived when this matter ought to receive thorough consideration by the judicatories of the Church. The only Reformed school in this section is Clarion Collegiate Institute at Rimersburg, Pa. It is an institution, however, that is in every way very worthy of the patronage and support of the entire Synod, and one that ought, in our judgment, receive favorable consideration and substantial aid from the Synod without any further delay.

#### THE PROGRESS MADE.

As we now stand on the eminence of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pittsburg Synod, and look back upon its past history we must with grateful hearts proclaim its accomplishments as having been great and valuable from an ecclesiastical and religious point of consideration. The statistics this year show 72 ministers, 17,103 members, \$20,166 benevolent contributions, and \$65,601 for congregational purposes. The Synod consequently has to-day almost twice as many ministers, and more than twice as many members as it had at the time of its organization; and contributed for benevolence more than three times, and for local purposes probably more than four times as much the last year as it did during its first year. The percentage of increase in numbers and grace of giving, which is an

index of faith and Christian life, has been about 200 per cent. during the first twenty-five years of its existence. The Synod has from the beginning until now contributed for benevolence the sum total of \$357,127.06. These figures show that the people of this portion of the Church deserve the commendation not only of their own Synod, but also of the whole Church for the liberality which they have exercised; and they are also a cause for devout gratitude to God for the many blessings He has bestowed upon this part of His divine heritage.

The accomplishments of the Reformed Church in this portion of the country during the past twenty-five years are to be seen, also, in the number of congregations organized and churches built since the founding of the Synod. In cities, towns, and rural districts where there were no Reformed Churches, or only small beginnings at that time, there now are flourishing congregations with, in many instances, commodious and elegant church edifices. Examples of such we have at Wilhelms, in Meyersdale, Johnstown, Latrobe, Mt. Pleasant, Wilkinsburg, East End, Kittanning, DuBois, Butler, Greenville, and Meadsville. Besides these a dozen or two congregations, not so well established but full of promise, have within these years been organized in all sections of the Synod.

Again, it is to be noted that the great majority of the congregations established previous to the synodical organization, have also made marked progress both in internal growth and external improvements. The membership has been largely increased, and the spiritual resources of the people have been developed. Old, plain church buildings in town and country have given place to large, fine edifices of modern architecture, and various Christian forces have been called into activity and exercise. An illustration of the progress made along these lines is to be found in Greensburg, where there are two congregations that twenty years ago were comparatively small in numbers and weak in spiritual force, worshiping in poor, uninviting churches and needing the aid of country congregations in the support of their pastors; but now these same congrega-

tions are large and flourishing, thoroughly organized, efficiently active in all forms of Christian work, and worshipping in capacious and elegant temples of the Lord. Illustrations of a similar kind are to be found in Grace Church, Pittsburg, in Irwin and Berlin, at Denmark Manor, Emmanuel and Harrolds in the country, and in many other places throughout the Synod.

The churches of Pittsburg Synod are keeping abreast with the progress of these modern times. The members thereof, as a general rule, are devoted, intelligent, wide-awake, and active. Missions, Home and Foreign, the cause of education and of the orphan are receiving the hearty support of the people. They have, within the last several years, subscribed and largely paid, \$30,000 for the establishment of a professorship in the theological Seminary at Lancaster. St. Paul's Orphan Home, at Butler, an institution of the Synod, and for thirteen years under the efficient management of Dr. P. C. Prugh, is two hundred per cent. more valuable, better equipped, and generally adapted for usefulness, than it was at the origin of the Synod, and is commanding the admiration of all who have learned to know its condition and working. Without particularizing further, let us all join in praising the Lord for His gracious favors and innumerable blessings shown towards and bestowed upon the ministers and people of this Synod, by which they were enabled, in this comparatively short period of time, to accomplish such great and memorable things for His Church. To Him be the glory.

#### THEOLOGICAL POSITION.

Pittsburg Synod has all along stood, and stands now, for a churchly theology and cultus. She rests her faith in God manifested in the flesh. She believes in the Christian Church, the body of Christ, as representing and mediating objective, spiritual, living realities. The preaching of God's Word and the administration of the sacraments have a content and meaning for her upon which faith may rest and which may be spiritually appropriated, such as nothing else has or can have. Upon this fundamental conception of God and His Church, she bases

herself in her faith and practice. All other religious exercises, practices, and instrumentalities are held in proper subjection and must lead up to the Word and Sacrament, as these are dispensed in the services of the sanctuary of the Lord. She plants herself firmly on that symbol of Christian faith and religious practice which was adopted by the Reformed Church in the early days of the Reformation—the Heidelberg Catechism. This confession not only, in common with all the leading confessions of the universal Church, sets forth our holy Christianity as an objective reality at hand for God's people, to which conception Pittsburg Synod clings with an ever-tightening grasp, but it also possesses some peculiar features which especially commend it to the minds of ministers and people, and endear it most tenderly to their hearts.

*First,* The Heidelberg Catechism makes the Lord Jesus Christ central for faith, and makes the vital relation of the individual to Christ the foundation of his hope and comfort. The divine decrees are relegated to the unexplained mysteries of God in the background, with which we are not immediately concerned, and the Son of God made flesh is brought forward to confront every one with His claims. Those who accept Christ as their Saviour with a true faith, and obediently follow Him unto the end, are given the promise of eternal life; and those who refuse to accept Christ and keep His commandments are given the solemn warning, that unless they repent and believe they will be forever lost. This is the gospel that constitutes the underlying theme of the entire Catechism, and this is the gospel which we preach. We are taught, and we teach, that our only comfort in life and death is to be found in the fact that we belong to our faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ. This is the primary and fundamental thought, in relation to which and in the light of which, all the subsequent teachings of the confession must be understood and applied.

*Second,* But while the Heidelberg Catechism teaches that the heavenly realities are objectively present through the ministrations of the Church for the salvation of men, yet it holds

them to be present in such sense and manner as that they can be apprehended and appropriated alone through the exercise of a true faith. It does not teach, and we do not believe, that the life and spirit of the glorified Saviour can be so localized and associated with material elements that they can in any sense be received through the mouth or any other bodily organ. We do not believe that there can be any communion of the Lord whatsoever with a soul that is without faith. Hence we, in strict harmony with the catechism from first to last, emphasize the necessity of a living, personal faith in God in order to salvation.

Without calling attention to the particular features of the Catechism at length, we would affirm that, as a Synod, we are fully persuaded that the system of faith and doctrine outlined by our confession is a correct representation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. But we do not affirm that it is in every particular in perfect accord with the Word of God; for we do not believe that any confession produced by uninspired men is absolutely perfect in its presentation of the doctrines and faith of the Gospel. We do not believe that any man, or any set of men, ever lived who were able to apprehend and comprehend divine Revelation in all its fullness. Hence, not the confession, but the Holy Scriptures, constitute the final appeal in all matters of faith and practice. And consequently, it also follows, that all confessions, excepting only those that contain simply a few general, essential articles of faith, need to be explained, emended and corrected as the body of believers in subsequent ages arrive at a fuller and more accurate understanding of the Gospel. We do not believe that any confession is perfect. We do not believe that the Heidelberg Confession is absolutely perfect. The Church in general has no doubt, in a few particulars, reached a better apprehension of the truth than that represented by the catechism. But the discrepancy is not sufficiently serious to call for a revision of the confession. And we cherish the conviction, begotten of the truth as we believe, that no other confession in entire Christendom is as fully in harmony with the

general consensus of the Christian faith of the modern Church, and hence with the Word of God, as is the Heidelberg Catechism.

#### CONFLICTS.

When we say that Pittsburg Synod has held fast, in her teaching and preaching, to the objective verities of the Gospel, as set forth in the Catechism, we do not wish to be understood as meaning that the confessions of all other churches represent the Gospel less objectively. All the confessions, indeed, of the Reformation churches confront the world with a positive churchly Christianity. But some of these churches, as represented in the territory covered by Pittsburg Synod twenty-five years ago, were, in their faith and practices, not true to their own confessional standards; and hence the Reformed Church, as represented by Pittsburg Synod, came into more or less conflict with the religious spirit that prevailed in a general way in entire Western Pennsylvania, and very largely in particular localities.

Such was notably the case in the district covered by Somerset Classis. Here what was styled *New Measurism* was for a decade or two very prevalent in the Christian community. A few of our ministers and some of our members yielded to the pressure of the new views and practices, and, to an extent at least, imbibed the spirit so foreign to the genius of the Reformed Church; but the majority in the ministry and the staunch and steadfast portion of the membership stoutly resisted the wave of religious excitement that threatened to sweep everything before it. With the view of establishing and confirming the Reformed people in their faith, and of holding up before all who would give heed a churchly apprehension of the Gospel, the Reformed ministers formed themselves into an association that held monthly public conferences from one end of the county to the other, at which they discussed such questions as, "*The Church*," "*The Sacraments*," "*The Word of God*," "*Faith*," "*Regeneration*," "*Conversion*," "*Educational Religion*," and the like. The main purpose of the preaching and discussions of these brethren was to re-instate in the hearts and minds of the people the churchly

idea of religion over against a subjectivism that largely ignored the Church with her sacred ordinances. They labored not in vain. The Reformed Church was held true to her traditions and historical standards; and some of her traducers have lived to learn that the course she pursued is the more excellent way.

The Reformed household lost a few members here and there in this struggle; but it was more than compensated for this apparent loss by the development of a church consciousness and a great increase of internal strength, by which it was enabled to accomplish much more in an outward way in subsequent years. The ministers who took the leading part in those religious struggles were Drs. W. Rupp, G. H. Johnston, A. J. Heller and A. B. Koplin. They were all young in years and experience, and neither of them then yet bore the title of Doctor of Divinity. But they were vigorous in mind and strong in the faith. They studied much and labored hard, and were carried along by an enthusiasm produced by the conviction that they were on the side of the truth, which made them bold to grapple with any subject of dogmatic and practical theology.

Justice and truth require us yet to say that the denomination which had in those days been to the greatest extent carried from her moorings by New Measurism and general unchurchliness, has since largely reclaimed herself, and is now doing her work in more faithful obedience to her standards, that have stood the test of centuries.

#### CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES.

Pittsburg Synod has all along been characterized by a few peculiar features. One of the founders of it writes that during his connection with the body it was noted for the harmonious views and fraternal feelings of its members. They were of one mind theologically and of one heart in purpose. Hence the best of feelings prevailed amongst them all the time. The same general spirit characterizes the body to-day. In all its history it has been remarkably free of parties and factions. Any member or set of members that would undertake to manipulate the

affairs of Synod to any marked extent would soon find themselves shorn of their influence. The prevailing feeling is that of Christian sympathy and cordial co-operation.

Another of the original members mentions the freedom exercised in debate by all the members as one of the peculiarities of the Synod. Speaking of the early meetings, he says: "There were some fierce debates, in which each member seemed to consider himself under special obligation to say what he pleased." The Synod has not yet outlived this characteristic. As a general rule, the members all feel free to talk on any subject that comes before the body, and generally express themselves in very positive terms and in a manner most direct. Sometimes a question is most earnestly and frankly discussed for several sessions, as was the question of Publication at Greenville, in 1887, and that of the election of a Theological Professor at Irwin, in 1892. But when a subject has been decided, harmony reigns again, and the minority unites honestly in carrying out the decisions of the majority. These features make it pleasant to be a member of Pittsburg Synod.

#### THE FUTURE OUTLOOK.

When we now turn our faces to the future what shall we say? Has Pittsburg Synod reached its highest degree of accomplishments? Not if true to its mission. It is challenged by a loud call to special consecration, special effort, and special aggressive work for the further development of the resources, and the external enlargement of the Church it represents. The peculiar circumstances demand this. Unless all indications are misleading, Western Pennsylvania is destined to become a celebrated portion of our great country. Pittsburg is the centre of this district. It is already a great city. It has wealth, intelligence, integrity and enterprise. And the "Greater Pittsburg," towards which its citizens are now striving, will no doubt become an actual fact before long, when the city limits will be extended ten or fifteen miles on all sides so as to include not only its twin sister, Allegheny, but all the numerous surrounding suburbs,

and Pittsburg become a corporation of immense possibilities. According to the law of all past experiences the present enervating and disheartening business depression of the country will be followed by a period of prosperity. And in this prosperity Pittsburg will largely share. It must be so, for Providence is in its favor. Note the natural advantages of this section. With its Ohio River for a water outlet, with its Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers and their tributaries affording advantages for all kinds of manufacturing establishments, with its glades for grazing, and its rich soil for all kinds of farming purposes, with its petroleum, limestone and vast abundance of gas, fuel and coking coal; with its many railroads centering in Pittsburg, and with the completion of the proposed ship canal to the lakes, with its position between the East and the West, the North and the South, western Pennsylvania unquestionably has a great future before it. Its metropolis will make large strides forward and become more than ever a successful competitor with all the great cities of the land, and the towns and villages within a radius of a hundred miles from the city will also increase in size and material prosperity. Of this progress the members of the Reformed Church will partake. They will become richer in this world's goods, filled with worldly wisdom, and inspired by ingenuity and enterprise. There will be a large influx of people to this portion of the State from which the Reformed congregations will receive additional members. Now then Pittsburg Synod would certainly be unmindful of its opportunities, derelict in its manifest duty, untrue to the Church it represents, and unfaithful to the Lord, whose work it is called to do, if it did not call forth all its energies and put forth its greatest efforts to save its own members, increase its congregations and establish many new ones, and do its part with other churches in Christianizing the people that are here and that are coming here. The second quarter of a century, therefore, upon which the Synod is entering, is no time for rest and peace. The Brethren must not lay aside their armor. The challenge is to gird up the loins and go forth to battle; to plant the standard

of the cross on new fields and cause the banner of the Lord to wave over newly-conquered battlements. The duty of the hour is to make the name Reformed better known and more honored, and to cause Pittsburg Synod to be respected and admired for the many good works accomplished by it in the name of the Master. And public institutions and other Synods of the Church will exercise but common sanctified wisdom if they will recognize the possibilities of Pittsburg Synod and cordially receive it as an important ally in the common cause in which they are all engaged.

#### IN MEMORIAM.

The dead—where are they? They are no longer with us in the flesh. They finished their work, and now rest from their labors. Through summer's heat and winter's storm they followed their calling. When fatigued in body and faint at heart they stood at the sacred desk and held forth the word of life. Amid the perplexities, disappointments, and manifold trials of a pastor's life, they pursued the course marked out by Providence; but now they are at rest. How sweet the thought that for a life so full of labor and sorrow there remaineth a rest in the paradise of God! Can we not appreciate ever more fully the feelings of the great Apostle that moved him to say, "For me to live is Christ and to die is gain."

In the contemplation of our departed brethren, how pleasant the thought that God is still their God; that Jesus is still their Saviour; that the Holy Spirit is still their Comforter; that they belong to us and we to them; that—

"The saints on earth and all the dead  
But one communion make;  
All join in Christ, their living Head,  
And of His life partake."

And seeing that one by one our days are ended, and that we know not whom next the Lord will call, what manner of persons ought we to be, "in all holy living and godliness?" We ought to be moved to give ourselves diligently to meditation and

prayer, and work with all our might the work the Lord has given us to do, so that when the silent footsteps of the heavenly messenger appear we may in triumph exclaim: We have fought the good fight, we have finished the course, we have kept the faith; henceforth there are laid up for us crowns of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to us at that day; and not only to us, but to all them that have loved His appearing.

NOTE.—The writer hereby expresses his obligations to the Stated Clerks of the several Classes of Pittsburg Synod, especially to Rev. J. F. Snyder, and to Revs. J. F. Wiant, Dr. I. H. Reiter and others, for valuable assistance rendered in gathering the historical material for the foregoing paper.

## VI.

### EXTRACTS FROM GIOBERTI.

BY REV. CHARLES C. STARBUCK.

## II.

To assist the memory of the reader, let me recall Gioberti's fundamental thought. The undifferentiated fulness of the Divine ideas is the Initial Methexis or Metessi. The differentiation of this fulness, resulting in comparative emptiness of each particular, and in transient and relative antagonisms, is the Mimesis (*Ital.* Mimesi). The return toward God, resulting in ultimate and eternal harmony, preserving the differentiations, but overcoming their temporary antagonisms, is the Final Metessi.

### EXTRACTS.

The history of the Word described by St. John is not only that of God, but of thought and of human civilization. Because civilization is thought, and thought is the appearance of the Word in the world. Notice the conflict between the Word or light and the darkness—that is, between the intelligible and the sensible, the metessi and the mimesi. In this conflict and in the triumph of the nobler element, consists the progressive history of the human race. John, therefore, beginning with the history of the Word, indicates that the Gospel—that is, *thought incarnate in Christ*, was the creation of a new process of civilization. The Divine filiation of men brought in by the Word is the consciousness of thought, the metessi, whereby the creature approaches to the Creator, and has part in Him.

In the Incarnation the external action of the Word is more limited than in nature. The natural Logophany embraces the universe and extends through all the parts of the concreative

act; because the Word in this case is the creative act itself. Hence it embraces the corporeal as well as the moral part, the intellect as well as the will, the inferior beings as well as man, the worlds as well as the earth, etc. It extends through all places and times. The Logophany of Christ, on the other hand, is limited. It also is universal; but only in one respect, that is, by directing the means to one sole end. This end is human morality, virtue and its celestial beatitude. And this end is supreme; wherefore in this respect Christ is the apex of the world appearing in nature, and the second Logophany is superior to the other in this respect. Whence, also, the hypostatic union of the Word with man in the Christian Logophany is more intimate than that creative union in the natural Logophany.

In other respects the Christian Logophany is less extended than the other. It limits itself directly to the earth; on the earth to man; among men it does not communicate itself except successively to all individuals, races, places. It is successive, not simultaneous. It looks to the will, and only obliquely to the other powers. It occupies itself directly with morals and religion, not with civilization, politics, literature, etc. The limitation of the author is found in his work. Christianity, the Gospel, are less universal than nature. Those who would make of the Gospel a code of politics, of Christianity a literature, etc., do violence to the nature of things, because Christianity presupposes the other elements (as *e. g.*, the Pelasgic), and does not contain them. Therefore those err who wish to reduce everything to Christianity. Such are the reasons which war against the universality of Christianity. However, other reasons show us that the Christian Logophany and its work are universal. And how could the Word operate otherwise and halve himself? To conciliate dialectically the two statements there is need to distinguish the power and the act. The Christian Logophany and the Gospel are universal in potency, not actually. Their actual universality limits itself to virtue, to religion, to heaven, which are the culminating, sovereign, final,

palingenesiac point. The rest is subordinate to this. But precisely because they limit themselves to the end, to the final point, and because this embraces all the means, it results that in this respect all is potentially in Christianity, all is ordained for Christianity. This, then, is universal initially and finally, potentially and teleologically. Christianity is in nature, and nature in Christianity, as the spirit in the body and the body in the spirit, time in space and space in time, music in architecture and architecture in music, in diverse respects. They are reciprocally dialectic container and content. But as in every reciprocity of such sort, the one of the members prevails in point of dignity, logical priority, excellence, and this is the primordial container; in such a respect Christianity, as act, end, palingenesia, morality, religion, heaven, prevails over nature, which is potency, principle, cosmos, civilization, earth, etc. Logically, in fact, the end contains the beginning. On this account the natural Logophany is contained in the Christian. In this aspect Christ and Christianity are absolutely universal, as the palingenesiac universe.

St. John, St. Athanasius, and other Fathers, admit two special potentialities and two incarnations of the Word in the world. The one anterior to Christ, universal, occult. The other in Christ, special, individual, manifest, purely human. These two incarnations answer to the mimesi and the metessi. The first was made generically, potentially, hence was cosmic not human, universal not individual, virtual not actual. The second was actual, human, individual. The rationalists, who deny the special incarnation of the Word in Christ and admit a general incarnation in the world and in the human species, confound the potency with the act and immolate the act, the individual to the potency, according to the genius of pantheism. That which these say of the actual incarnation, is only true of the potential. They do not perceive that the potency is generic in its nature; but does not actuate itself except in the individual.

Immortality is the passage from the past into the future, from history into prophecy, from earth into heaven, from geol-

ogy into uranology. The realm of the shades becomes the realm of spirits. From the dusky centre of the earth it passes into heaven. Continuity and immanence is the bond of the two states. The beginning becomes end. The primal potency becomes ultimate act. The earth is the repository of the germs of beings yet to be born, and as it were the embryo (potency); and is at the same time the sepulchre of the beings that have lived. These two ideas are united in the biblical *sheol*. Limbus of past and future things; in it the past colleagues itself with the future (Psalm 139 and Job). The earth, as geology shows, contains the relics of extinct existences. Hence *sheol*, the abyss, the abode of the giants, who are covered with the waves of the sea (cataclysm), which destroyed the anterior creations.

The pain of hell is not meritorious, because it is not voluntary and free. But it is expiatory, because it diminishes the guilt and the vicious habit. Hence the pains of the reprobate go on decreasing. The theory of the successive diminution of the pains is profoundly philosophical. On the one hand it conciliates the doctrine of the eternity of the pains with the Divine goodness, and with the benevolent instincts of the human heart, and with the universality of the palingenesia. It preserves whatever truth there is in Origenism. On the other, it harmonizes Hell with the palingenesiac doctrine of Paradise. Hell is an infinite annulment of pain and of guilt, as Paradise is an infinite augmentation of holiness and of beatitude. The annulment in the first case, like the augmentation in the other, cannot be infinite, but only potentially; and hence it will never be complete. Hell will, therefore, never be able to become Paradise. However, it appertains in a certain manner to Paradise, as Erigena says: *Ero morsus tuus, O inferne*. The reason is (not observed by Erigena) that Hell, in so far as it has positiveness, in so far as it appertains not to nothingness, but to existence, is an approximation to Paradise, and the potency of it; an approximation, however, and a potency, which will never attain their actuation and completion. Hell, as negative, is negation of existence and of Paradise, that is nothing; but as nothing it

cannot subsist. Hell must needs have some element of positiveness. This positiveness consists precisely in the successive negation of the negative, that is, of the privation, and hence in the successive and infinite diminution of the pains; from which ensues an infinite ampliation of the potency, and an infinite approach to Paradise without ever arriving there. Hell, therefore, is a virtual palingenesis, a semi-palingenesis, a true mimesis, and has to Paradise the same relation which the cosmos has towards the universal palingenesis.

Existence being inamissible, absolute pain is inconsistent with it, as being that which is nothing. Whence also here below we see that pain, if it exceeds a certain mark, or endures too long, kills. Pain is a mimetic thing, serves nature as means, not as end. The pain of Hell itself cannot be perpetual, except so far as it goes on successively diminishing and in some manner ameliorates the soul and the state of the sufferers. Hell is a purgatory without end.

Hell is the perpetuity of the state of the fallen earth; that is, to speak theologically, of man in the state of original sin. Now, original sin is nothing else than the fall of man from the supernatural state (indivisible from the perfection of his nature) into the natural state. Then Hell is the perpetual exclusion of man from the supernatural state; it is the degradation without end of man into a state inferior, and hence finite in its nature, as Paradise is exaltation, ingradation to a superior state. In saying state, I say kind; whence the glorified man (comprehensor) is a man transhumanated, as the lost reprobate is a man dishumanated. The one approaches the angel, the other the brute. Hell, therefore, does not consist in the eternity of evil, as the scholastics believed. The only eternal thing is the exclusion from the supernatural good.

The supernatural amnesty is only possible. It is a thing as destructive to the law and the authority of the lawgiver to deny the absolute possibility, as to affirm the future existence of amnesty. Because a law which is accompanied by an act of amnesty is no longer law. And a lawgiver who should not have

authority to remit the penalty is no longer lawgiver, absolute sovereign. Nor let it be said that God has divested Himself of such power; because He could not divest Himself of it without abdicating His own divinity. But the exercise of such a power is only possible and nothing more.

The repose of the future life taught by Revelation is relative to the present motion. But the future rest will be accompanied by another motion toward a higher state. Here man concretes with God, but without possessing Him. There his concreative act will be more intimate. Such intimacy will go on increasing to infinity, because it can never attain to the theandria.

Paradise is creation, action, not quiet. But action without pain, creation without straining, work without fatigue. Love, in heaven as on earth, is dead without works. The paradise of the Mystics is a weariness only to think of. Maistre and Leopardi observe this. Dante depicts the paradise of the Mystics, and therefore is not very attractive. The Contemplatives form to themselves a false idea of the beatific contemplation, by dividing, in mentality, the pole of thought from the pole of action. The Bible represents to us beatitude as active. It affords us the pattern of the angels, who are the glorified (*comprehensores*) of an earlier creation. Now the angels are *administratores spiritus*, companions, ministers, vicegerents of God in the government of the universe.

The rejection of angelology is a proof of the narrowness of modern rationalism and pantheism. The patrons of this appear to me like to those Peripatetics of the seventeenth century who turned their backs on the telescope, and insisted on measuring the heavenly distances and marvels with the naked eye. Revelation is the telescope of religion. Angelology immensely enlarges the area of this, showing us that the solar and planetary worlds are only the shell of the universe. Angelology shows us the interior nature of the universe in pure mentality, in intelligence; as astronomy shows us its exterior nature in the multitudes of worlds and suns. Angelology and astronomy are sisters. Revelation, which is the telescope of philosophy, has

revealed to us the world of angels, as it were, sidereal splendors, which illumine the firmament of spirits and the palingenesiac universe.

Demonology and angelology are repudiated by the rationalists, as, *e. g.*, by Strauss, as wretched, arbitrary, ridiculous fictions. They do not perceive that these supposed fictions are nothing else than the interplication of an anterior metessi with the present mimesi and with a future metessi. They are conjoined with the origin and with the finality of our world.

Mentality may increase in two ways: intensively, *i. e.*, individually; and extensively, *i. e.*, collectively. The first progress is aristocratic, the second democratic. The two modes of progress ought to be joined together to make the perfect progress. Philosophy is the principal instrument of the aristocratic progress, religion of the democratic. Philosophy is of few, Religion of all.

I do not mean to put all opinions on a level, as if they were equally false or true. I call the opinions true in which the truth prevails; and false those in which falsehood prevails. But as in the false opinions there is truth, so in the true there is falsity, *i. e.*, inexactness, incompleteness. The element of truth which is found in the false opinions is that which constitutes the semi-orthodoxy of heterodox opinions. Heterodoxy is semi-orthodox when the quantity of the true which is found in it is almost equal to that of the false.

Heterodoxy is chaos, because it is the sum of all excesses, the medley of unharmonized contraries. Orthodoxy is order, because it is the dialectical mean which harmonizes the contraries by cutting off their extremes.

Descartes said: "I am; I think God; therefore God is."

I say: "God is; God creates me; therefore I exist."

In all other sciences besides philosophy, tradition is admitted, as in everything else, because without it preceding labors are useless, and there is no progress. What, in fact, is civilization if not tradition and innovations conjoined? Where is the savant, even in the most imperfect sciences (as, for instance,

physiology), who would venture to commence by annulling all antecedent labors, and placing himself at the beginning of the human race, as has been done in philosophy by Locke, and still more by Descartes? The latter did in philosophy what the National Convention did in politics: he wished to create science *ab ovo*, as the Convention undertook to do for human society. French mobility and lightness stand out in both actions.

Talleyrand used to observe that theology is helpful toward the conduct of affairs. Why? Because (1) it subtilizes the spirit; (2) it does not evaporate it, because the substance of such abstractions is concrete; that which vaporizes it is pantheistic speculation, like that of the German pantheists; (3) it enlarges it by virtue of the cosmopolitanism of the religious idea.

Every new conception which is presented to the mind of man is the preparation, near or remote, of a new fact.

Philosophy and Religion are distinct, because diverse; they ought not to be confused, but to be mutually helpful. Errors opposed and sophistical of those who wish to have philosophy absorb religion (rationalists), or religion absorb philosophy (hyper-mystics). They are useful, the one to the other. Religion restrains philosophy from becoming godless. Philosophy restrains religion from becoming superstitious. And this by means of the habit which they infuse. The habit, that is, the Christian sense, preserves philosophy from negative excesses. The habit, that is, the rational and natural sense, preserves religion from hyper-mystic excesses.

The opposition introduced by the rationalists between philosophy and revelation is a sophism. Opposition can only exist between two things of one and the same category. Who dreams of opposition between philosophy and poetry, between science and human activity? Philosophy is science; religion therefore would have to be a pure science in order to be opposed to it. Now (as is proverbial), religion embraces all the human faculties; and is principally affection, will, action; dogma is subordinate to this.

Those who say that science is to be reduced to simple facts

do not know their own meaning. Observation alone cannot supply a scientific cognition, if it is not fecundated by ideas, as the ideas, when created beings are in question, if they are not coupled with observation, become empty abstractions, and have no solidity or concreteness.

All is true and all is false in the world. Absolute skepticism and dogmatism need to be conjoined dialectically, and make up etisological science. Creation is true. Every idea, every fact is true. Nothing is false. Every negation is false. [That is, all falsehood, in the last analysis, is privative, only truth is positive.—C. C. S.]

All the systems which separate the human from the Divine, which despoil that of the adornment and foundation of this, are ugly, displeasing, superficial. Such are Pelagianism, Molinism, Sensism, etc.

Intuition and reflection. Saint Thomas has given the philosophy of reflection; Saint Bonaventura that of intuition. Conjoined they form the perfect philosophy, the perfect realism. They correspond in the Christian cycle to that which Aristotle and Plato were in the Gentile. Analogy between the genius of their doctrine and the religious order to which each belonged. The Dominicans, the *Ordo Prædicatorum*, are ministers of the word, that is, of reflection. The Franciscans of contemplation, that is, of intuition. An analogous portrait of St. Dominic and St. Francis given by Dante.

In the midst of so great a darkness Providence inspired two men to restore the Church and dissipate the barbarism, thus signalizing the dawn of the new civilization. Francis and Dominic created under the great Innocent the two families of the Minorites and of the Preachers, which, reassuming the interrupted work of Hildebrand and of Bernard, deserve to be saluted as two of the principal authors and co-workers of modern civilization. Those who accuse of barbarism these two families and, I might almost say, elective nations of Christianity, do not perceive that in doing so they accuse of barbarism the principal instruments of that refinement and culture of which

we all account ourselves glad and proud. Oh, when shall we cease to be ungrateful towards our parents? When will History become possessed of impartiality and of justice, and worthy of expressing the voice of the people and of God? To write the annals of these two illustrious orders, to show their influence on the advancing civilization of all the parts of Christendom and specially of Italy, would be an enterprise worthy of our age in its fondness for historical studies, and worthy of the Italians, who by an admirably attuned good sense are perhaps the most capable of this. Nor would it be needful to draw up a panegyric; but to recount the good things and the bad, with the conscientiousness of the historian and impartiality of the philosopher; because if the imperfection of our nature never permits the first to come unattended by the second, the former are so superior in number and in greatness that more is not needed to insure to these two orders the gratitude of posterity.

Philosophy in the Socratic schools was associated with morals. Before Socrates it was the science of the beginning; after Socrates that of the end. The one looked to the past and the other to the future. They parted between them the two cycles [of Descent and Return.—C. C. S.].

The factitious is a mimesi without metessi.

The Germanic philosophy in general and specially Hegelianism exaggerates the force of reason and of philosophy or science. The human reason, according to the Hegelians, is coincident with the true, and philosophy can aspire to know truth entirely. This presumption is contrary to the order of the universe. Besides that the human reason is finite, the philosophy from which the new sages promise themselves so much is not the actual, but the palingenesiac. The present philosophy is bound to be mimetic, imperfect like the present man. The work must needs be proportionate to the artificer. It must needs recognize limits; and the limits are the *mysteries*. Only in virtue of the mysteries can it be infinitely progressive. The true philosophy, therefore, must needs have before it a mysterious perspective, to which it can only attain approximatively.

Comte and Littré are right in wishing that philosophy should be positive. But they are wrong in therefore rejecting religion and metaphysics. Metaphysics makes part of nature, because it is thought; religion makes part of nature, because it is the infinite. Nature ought not to separate itself either from philosophy, or from religion, or from political life. Nature is the universe. Nature is the rule, support, confirmation of science, of religion, of politics. The marriage with it restrains philosophy from degenerating into empty ideology (scientific nominalism). It restrains political aims from degenerating into Utopia (civil nominalism). It restrains religion from degenerating into mysticism (theological nominalism). The harmony of philosophy, politics and religion is the guarantee of their positivity. The modern spiritualistic systems are wrong in severing themselves too far from Sensism, *i. e.*, from the positive side of nature. Nature is the criterion of thought and of action, according to the doctrine of Tertullian. This doctrine is Christian, because evangelical Christianity ameliorates nature, does not combat it, or divorce from it. The terrestriality and temporality of Christianity are the proof of it. God, the State, and science are the three resultants of nature.

God alone has the full idea of us. God alone has the perfect *consciousness* of man, because He is the Creator of him, and only the creative principle fully compenetrates nature.

The First Principle does not develop itself, but creates; the others do not create, but develop themselves.

The arguments of credibility vary according to the times, although their logical force is always the same, because the validity of the proofs, besides their objective weight, must also be subjective, that is, attemper itself to the opinions of men, whose intellect lives in a species of moral atmosphere which has influence upon their judgments. Thus, to-day such is the sway of the physical sciences, created yesterday, that by the most the supernatural is not admitted. As formerly things supernatural were exaggerated at the expense of nature, so now nature is exaggerated at the expense of the supernatural. This whim

cannot endure, and a time will come in which the dialectical harmony of the supernatural with nature will control men's minds; and rationalism, as well as the supernatural of the Middle Ages (Jesuitism), will be impossible. But, meanwhile, in the actual condition of men's minds, the supernatural (miracles, prophecies), in place of being an argument of credibility, must needs be a matter of faith.

Two systems in theology to be avoided: Scholasticism and Rationalism.

Scholasticism contains the substance of the true, and in this respect is superior to Rationalism. But it is dead, stationary, ultra-mysterious, and hence also retrograde, and *separates*, isolates the superintelligible from the intelligible, rendering it impersuasive, extrinsic to the opinion, to the intellectual and moral life of the age. It is antiquated because not mitigated by any touch of modernness. The harmony of antiquity with modernness is that which alone forms the life; as of style, so of opinions.

Rationalism confounds the superintelligible with the intelligible; is negative; superficial, like the Deism of the last century.

It breaks the thread of tradition, and denies it; is ineffacious, frivolous. Thus the superficiality and weakness of fashion. Fashion is modernness not mitigated by ancientness, not rooted in the past; and hence not suited to lay hold of the future, because the past alone gives the harmony; tradition alone gives the progress of science.

Orthodoxy has for its opposite heterodoxy. But as ideally orthodoxy is all the true and all the good, heterodoxy is nothing. Historically the case is different, because, as such, orthodoxy is Catholicism as it is found in a given place and time. In this respect heterodoxy is not nothing, but consists of two elements; the one negative, the other positive. The negative element is the denial of orthodoxy, that is, nothing; the positive element is the protest against the defects of historical Catholicism. In such a respect heterodoxy is useful and assists historical Ca-

tholicism, because it instructs it in that which is lacking to it for correspondence to its ideas. But it is clear that this does not militate against Catholicism, ideally considered; because, so regarded, Catholicism is perfect; nothing is lacking to it.

The distinction of the Middle Ages from the modern is an affair of space. Those are European, this cosmopolitan. Began with America. Produced the infinitesimal calculus. It is the age of the infinite, and distinguishes itself from antiquity, which is the age of the finite; and from the Middle Ages, in which the infinite is only in potency. Dante, Michael Angelo, Columbus, Galileo, Newton countersign the infinite character of the modern age.

Species and genera have certainly an objective reality; but we know it only imperfectly and mingled with many subjective elements. Hence two species of realism: the one approximative, which is the only one of which we are capable; the other absolute, which exceeds our faculties.

Unbelief in many has no other source than that Christianity is not presented to them in proportionate approximation to their mental state. They find it either *above* or *below* them, and hence reject it.

Sanctity ought to vary in type according to time and place. The Jesuits have introduced an immutable form of sanctity, taken from the legends, and propound it to the faithful. The sanctity of the legends is that of the Middle Ages. Hence these imitative (Catholic) saints of our days, without spontaneity, without vigor. Good people, but utterly useless and without influence. The appropriate modern form of sainthood has not yet been seen.

The Jesuits are the greatest enemies of the legitimate flexibility of Catholicism, and the greatest champions of the illegitimate, which consists in the relaxation of dogma and of morals, in Molinism and in Probabilism.

Botta says that letters soften manners and did that which religion had not been able to do; but he does not perceive that letters and the arts were themselves inspired by religion,

without which what would Dante, Michael Angelo, etc., have been?

Truth is relative; that which to-day is true relatively to the falsity of yesterday, becomes false relatively to the truth of to-morrow.

Three successive grades indicate the process of the Jesuit system: (1) To impede intellectual progress by force; (2) to impede it by a bad primary education, extinguishing curiosity and the love of truth; (3) to impede it by a bad adult education, prostrating the force of the intellect. The Jesuits are convinced that the progress of the spirit is irreconcilable with the old theology, and they are right. Therefore, say they, let us shut up the spirit.

One of the narrownesses of the vulgar theology is to give to Christianity one sole predecessor, Judaism. This belittles it, and gives to it the aspect of a sect. . . . The truth is, that Judaism was the only positive, direct, immediate predecessor. In another sense Christianity had all mankind for predecessor. Not, however, all the nations and races in the same manner. It had as predecessors in race, besides the Shemites, the Japhetites. It had as predecessors in language the Latin and the Greek. Every language is a repository of traditions, a channel of ideas. . . Who does not see how Hellenism and Romanism passed into Christianity?

Cicero calls philosophy *omnium artium officina; artium omnium procreatricem et parentem*. Behold the universality and the fruitfulness and the preëminence of philosophy. On this account the ancients used to call it the science of things Divine and human. It is the encyclopedia in potency. Its principles are to be *received*, not *made*. Hence it is a true initiation, of which God is the hierophant. God is the beginning and the end of it. The beginning of it is premundane, and the end ultramundane. It is a mystery and a secret of which revelation is the key. Hence is born the immutability of philosophy. The versatile philosophy, of which the history is drawn up and the vicissitudes are related, is the heterodox philosophy,

which is such only in name. Plato noted the immutability of philosophy.

If as ideal and thinkable a system is complete and self-consistent, of necessity it is true, *i. e.*, also real; because harmony can only be found in a false system which is not complete; and completeness can only be false when it is not harmonious. Completeness—*i. e.*, universality—and harmony conjoined are an infallible criterion of truth.

The completed truth is the criterion of the partial truths, the Idea of the ideas. Thus without a vicious circle, the true is criterion to itself; the total truth of the partial truths. As to the total truth towards itself there is no criterion, because it is autonomous. This being understood, the criterion of the truth of a system is its universality; that is, if it comprehends and colleagues, without distorting them, all the mother ideas that have place in the human intellect. Such a system is absolutely positive, not excluding any idea; hence it cannot be false. Error is negation of one or more ideas. The atheist denies God, the idealist bodies, the materialist the spirit, the fatalist the electing will, etc. Therefore, a system in which there is no negation, except of negation, cannot be false.

Let the forms of knowledge be transferred into God, and Kantism is true. Every thought of ours is the form of a thinker. But this thinker is the objective reason, and the ideal and real Being, not a created spirit.

Truth is thought. Hence, all that which man thinks is substantially true. To think the false is impossible, because it would be a thinking of nothing. Error consists only in negation. As every thought always has more or less of positiveness, it always, in this respect, has truth. Dialectics is the art which decants the thought and brings to distinctness the truth included in it.

The first, and most noble, and most potent force of the world is intelligence, created and creative. Ideas are the levers of the universe. To augment the intellective created virtue, and hence the dominion of the uncreated Idea, is the scope of civil-

ization. To diminish the amount of intelligence in the world is the scope of the Jesuits.

The ideas are nothing, according to the nominalists and the sensists; they are all, according to the true realists. The ideas are substances and occasions, or forces. They are substances because they subsist. They are occasions (in English rather, causes) because they operate. The efficacy of the ideas is seen in man, because they alone sway sovereignly individuals and peoples, inspire heroic actions, and create everything most beautiful, most grand, most arduous, that can issue from human nature. The efficacy of the ideas is seen likewise in nature, because they preside over all her normal operations. Without the presence of the ideas, the wonderful harmonies of light and of the stars, the crystallization of the minerals, the organism of the plants and of the brutes, the prodigious sense of instinct, are inexplicable. The idea creates literally its own copy. The force of the will, and of the other human powers, is born of the ideal influences.

Every man is a world, that is, a more or less ample centre of other men. I speak not merely of exterior and palpable actions and influences, as those of a king, of a captain, of a banker; I speak of the moral and spiritual influences, which escape the eye, because they appertain to the world of spirits. How overwhelmed we should be if we could see the numerous bonds of spirits in time and space! The most extended and powerful of these monarchies is that which is exercised by thought. The great founders of Religion, philosophers, poets, are more powerful than Cæsar or Alexander. The principality of Homer, and of Plato, endures till this day and will endure until the ages shall fail. What prince is there who has ever had so many subjects and admirers? But the action, the glory of these supreme men, is not of their age; it looks toward the future. They began to live when they died; so true is it that human preëminence, in all its forms, is a matter of memory.

The Platonic theory of reminiscence is true, substantially, and is only vitiated by an error of chronology. In the imma-

nent state man has the intuition of the pure ideas, and it is only in the successive state that he joins with them the sensitive perceptions, which trouble the native purity of these. These two states are simultaneous, inasmuch as the continuous duration of the first is accompanied at each instant by the successive duration of the second. The mistake of Plato is that of having considered them as following one the other, and not accompanying each other, in time; which constrained him to presuppose an anterior life and the eternity of the human soul.

The continuous precedes the multiplicity of the discrete, as relation the conflict of opposites. Now, relation is unity, harmony. Unity and harmony then precede the multiplex and the strife; perfection precedes imperfection. God precedes the world. This is the reverse of that which is said by Hegel, Speusippus, all the pantheists.

The Father answers to intuition, and the Word to reflection; the Father to knowledge and matter unformed, the Word to knowledge and matter formed. The word of men exercises a like office. By it the thought becomes external, practical, operative; knowledge, properly so called, and action. Hence the importance of formulas and names. The idea, says De Maistre, if I remember right, does not avail, is not operant, if it is not named. Who first gives name to a thing, he is the author and operator of it. The formula is the name of a law, of an action, as the name is the formula of a substance. From this arises the importance of formulas and of names in religion and in politics. He who criticises and derides the Nicene discussions, shows that he knows nothing about them.

ANDOVER, MASS.

## VII.

### "PRIVATE INTERPRETATION."

2 PETER I: 20.

BY REV. T. W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

THE connection of the passage in which these words occur is simple and clear. The Apostle had stated his purpose to strive while he lived to keep his brethren in remembrance of what they had heard, and also to prevent them from forgetting it after his death. For it was no fable by which the apostles were led; but they had been witnesses of the Transfiguration and had heard the heavenly voice. And they had the prophetic word made more sure by the confirmation it had received in Christ's mission, and to this word it behooved believers to give heed as the true source of enlightenment. And to do this to purpose they were to know first of all that it was of entirely divine origin. He lays stress upon this point as indispensable to the understanding or profitable use of the prophetic word. To make more clear the position he states it negatively and positively.

#### 1. THE NEGATIVE STATEMENT.

No prophecy of the Scripture is, or rather (*γίνεται*) arises from any private interpretation. There were, and perhaps still are, persons who refer these words not to the origination of Scripture, but to its explication, and suppose they were intended to warn us against individual explanations of Scripture as distinguished from those which are supported by the authority of the Church. And our Roman Catholic brethren usually regard it as a protest against the right of private judgment. If this were so, then the Apostle would be urging his brethren in two different ways at the same time, to give diligent heed to the word, and yet not to adopt its teachings unless certified from

other source. Other critics consider the clause to be a caution against interpreting particular portions separately by themselves, instead of interpreting them in the full light of prophecy as a whole. This is a very proper caution, and one to which expositors do well to take heed, but it does not spring out of the words themselves, nor does it agree with the context. The adjective rendered "Special" can hardly be understood to mean individual or separate, and if it could, one fails to see that this would form part of an argument to show the lofty origin and immeasurable dignity of the prophetic word. And if the Apostle had intended to give this caution to those to whom he wrote he would have put it in more direct and unambiguous terms.

The same objections lie against the view taken by Erasmus, Hofmann and others, and adopted by Dr. Thayer in his edition of Grimm's Lexicon. These make the clause assert the fact that the readers of prophecy are not able of their own understanding to interpret it; but are dependent upon the Holy Spirit for success. Or as Thayer says (under the word *idiai*), "an interpretation which one thinks out for himself, opposed to that which the Holy Spirit teaches." Here again is a very just and weighty sentiment; but it is not contained in the text which makes no reference to the blessed Spirit. Nor would this fact, were it so stated, serve Peter's purpose, which evidently is to attract men to the study of the Word, and not to caution them against an injurious method of study.

The wording of the passage is by no means obscure or difficult. A "prophecy of Scripture" means one that belongs to Scripture, one that is recognized as a part of the sacred volume. The word *is*, although it is retained in the Revised Version, does not properly represent the original, which means *comes into being or arises*. The adjective which follows it may be rendered *private or special* (R. V. Margin), or *one's own*, all of these senses being sustained by usage; but the last one being the more common as it is the root meaning of the word. The term rendered *interpretation* does not occur elsewhere in the New

Testament; but the cognate verb occurs twice (Mark iv: 34, Acts xix: 39), where it has the force of expounding or solving. The sense used in the common version, "interpretation," is generally admitted to be correct. The whole clause then means that no prophecy originates in the prophet's own interpretation of the facts of life and the ways of God. It is not the result of his own inquiries or investigations, but comes from a much higher source. The "interpretation" meant is not that of a student eagerly scanning the force and application of a prophecy already delivered; but the intelligent apprehension of truth by one who utters the prophecy. This does not arise from his own private studies or reflections. Thus viewed, the statement fits in admirably with what precedes and what follows. The apostle is urging close attention to the prophetic word, and he says that it is of primary importance to bear in mind that that word is something entirely different from man's own view of events or any mere human conception of what is true. So far from that, any real prophecy comes from one and the same impelling power, from one and the same illuminating influence, even from God himself, as Peter goes on to show.

## 2. THE POSITIVE STATEMENT.

The apostle gives a reason for the broad denial of human partnership in the origination of prophecy: "For not by man's will was prophecy born at any time." The reference was not to the utterance of a prophetic word, but to the *afflatus*, or inspiration, which gave it birth. This was not due to the acting of the prophet's own will. It was no independent volition on his part. His will of course concurred. He was not a mere musical instrument, an unconscious medium of transmission. Yet he did not originate anything. Left to himself, without any influence from the outside, he could not utter or record any real prophecy. The text affirms this as an absolute, universal statement. Never did any prophecy in all the past come into being at the beck of a mere human author. That is a matter which lies above and beyond the reach of a creature.

The Apostle completes his account of the origin of the Scripture by adding: "But, being borne on by the Holy Spirit, men spake from God." The version I have given follows the order of the original, and adopts the text now generally accepted (*ἀπο Θεοῦ*, instead of *ἀγιοι Θεοῦ*). The true text is shorter and clearer than the old reading. It drops the official description of the prophets as *holy men of God*, and, in harmony with the emphatic denial of the agency of human will in the matter, speaks of the bearers of the prophetic message simply as *men*. It declares that they became prophets only by receiving an impulse from the Holy Spirit, which bore them on. They, therefore, spake from God, that is, as commissioners from Him, having the starting point of their activity, not in their own will, but in God's will. The authorized version misses the point in saying that men "spake as they were moved," for what Peter says is that they spake *because* they were so moved. The term "borne on" may be illustrated from Acts xxvii. 15-17, where it is used of a ship *driven* before the wind.

The whole passage thus coheres together, and gives intense emphasis to the Apostle's injunction. He is anxious for the welfare of his brethren, and urges them to give earnest heed to the prophetic word, *i. e.*, the divine revelation of which they were in possession. The chief reason why he urges this duty is the familiar fact that the prophet of old was the bearer of a divine message. This was his differentiating characteristic. The prophetic word was in no sense or degree a result of the prophet's own power. He could not command it at will. He could only receive and utter and record what the Lord told him. In fact, when he did fulfill the function of his office, it was under an impulse from without. He was borne along by an irresistible influence, so that sometimes he was made the medium of communicating disagreeable or even painful information, what he would rather not say, but yet did say, because it came from God.

This being the case, the Scripture has an undeniable claim upon the attention of all men. When God speaks, everything

else must give way. We do well to bear in mind Peter's statement at a time when critical inquiries into the personal character and environment of the prophet are put so much in the forefront as to hide the real origin of his message, and make it appear to convey his own individual solution of the difficulties which beset men's minds in this life. This was so far from being the case that often the holy men did not understand their own prophecies, and needed to inquire and ascertain the purport of what the Spirit gave them to deliver.

Scripture is a message from God, and therefore differs *toto celo* from all other writings. It has final and absolute authority. It is to be treated reverently and with the respect due to its Divine Author. All its parts, taken together, constitute the revelation God has made of Himself and His will to the children of men. We must expect some things to be hard to understand; but if we once are fully persuaded that no part of it arose from any human author's personal notions, but that all bears the stamp of the Divine hand, we shall find our way easy and attractive. The Word will prove to us what Peter calls it, "a lamp shining in a squalid place," and by means of its illumination we shall be guided safely amid all the perplexities and obscurities of the present life.

## VIII.

### THE DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE.

BY PROF. JOHN B. KIEFFER, PH.D.

PROBABLY no question is at the present time receiving more attention in this country than that of the education of our youth in all its various grades. And after many efforts to extricate ourselves from a condition which thoughtful educators have felt to be chaotic in the extreme, we are, at least in one direction, beginning to see our way clear. The type of institution which for the future is to stand for the highest intellectual culture in America is taking upon itself shape, and is adapting itself to the conditions of our national life as distinct from that of England, or of the continent of Europe. The American university is nearly an existing institution, and the different organizations which are at work to bring into proper correlation the several branches of our educational system look with hopefulness to the future. If the university is practically here, as the culmination of our system, what, say they, is the position which the college should hold to the university on the one hand, and to the high school on the other? And they sum up their judgment, as Mr. Dewey did a year ago, in the statement that "a very few can be made into universities, but no creditable university can be made with less than \$10,000,000;" that the average college must, therefore, choose between three courses: It must get at least \$10,000,000 and be a university (financially crippled at that); or it must get under the university, and *above* but in immediate contact with the high-school, and be a college; or it must apparently be crowded out of existence.

With this scheme, beginning with the primary school and ending with the university, no thoughtful educator would have any desire to find fault,—looked at, let me hasten to add, from the point of view of those who have devised it. It stands for intellectual training pure and simple, as preparatory to professional or very highly specialized careers. And in this sense the university certainly is supreme, and the college ancillary and subordinate. But are we quite sure that the office of the college is to be only propædæutic to professional training? Is it

possible that there are other functions in education for it to fulfill, which it alone can fulfill, and the neglect of which may involve serious, if not irreparable, damage to society? Is there something for which the denominational college is pledged and responsible which no other institution can so well supply?

Education, we all know, is indeed a great blessing; but, alas, education is no panacea for human ills, nor will it secure either happiness or the power to fulfill to the uttermost the higher duties of life. The civilization which it evokes has no power to direct the will, or to restrain the fury of brutal passion. Humanity has again and again gone out into that wilderness only to return empty-handed, debauched, and filled with remorse.

Now I am very far from even entertaining the thought that the education of the system sketched above would, in itself, be immoral. Very far, indeed. But its morality, in the nature of the case, would be in spite of the system, and not because of it. For the world has so long lived in an atmosphere of Christian ethics that unconsciously all teaching, even in a system which confessedly makes intellectual training the *ne plus ultra* of education, is moral in every respect. But surely, at a time when we are every day told that we are in present danger of sinking to the moral and intellectual level of the Chinese, that the present movement in society is one of retrogression to Pagan ideals of life, and that we are on the verge of a world to which God is unknown, it behooves us to find, if possible, some escape from such a catastrophe. And it does not require a super-human wisdom to see that such an escape must needs be based on a system of training, in the matter of human character, that is thoroughly positive in its relation to ethics, not negative.

For the danger alluded to rests entirely on moral grounds, and is far from being only imaginary. Tendencies *are* at work which, if left unchecked, would certainly lead to such results. So much at least of truth may be found in the ratiocinations of the pessimist and the agnostic. The modern world is deeply indebted to physical science for a dominion over matter which has brought many an ethical problem nearer to solution than our fathers dreamed possible. But an absorbing devotion to physical science has brought with it also alarming negative results. Among other things it practically ignores human personality, or the power of choosing a course of action regardless of reasons for or against, and makes of man a human machine, purely self-regarding, and incapable of generous and noble sentiments. Nay, it says plainly: "The good man is a

machine, whose springs are adapted so to fulfill their functions as to produce beneficent results." And along with human personality this recognition of the all-controlling power of environment is, in the philosophy of many of our advanced thinkers, banishing the belief in a divine personality. Even Heine had seen the forecasting of this shadow: "See," says he, "all the gods have flown away, and there sits an old maid all by herself, with leaden hands and a sorrowful heart, and they call her name 'Necessity.'"

And popular politics joins hands with popular philosophy in its apparent opposition to the view that man is self-conscious, self-determined, morally responsible, and so a person. On all sides we hear that man belongs to the State, and that as old beliefs and old institutions pass away, as pass they must, the State will reach its rightful supremacy; and then will come an era when we shall no longer have a religion which to the positivist is inhuman, to the agnostic grotesque and incredible, and to the atheist absurd, but a religion of the State, a religion of humanity, where abstract figments are deified, and where religious life is a life of ever-shifting adjustments and relations.

Now black as is the picture which the pessimist thus draws of our future, it is black only to those who accept his conclusions. For, however strong the tendency to decay in human affairs is, the power to check and to correct it is present with us if we only use it wisely. For along with this skepticism, and keeping pace with all the material movements of the age, the observer of current opinion is amazed to find amongst the masses of the people a degree of religious fervor, and a sensitiveness to religious rights, such as has rarely been surpassed in the history of the world. It may show its presence only in negative forms, ignoring what have been the accepted creeds of the religious world. You may call it spiritualism, theosophy, or christian science; you may condemn it in the Salvation Army, or in humanitarian societies, as working against the church; but in whatever form it shows its presence it is a cry of the masses of humanity for spiritual help. Misguided, unwise, reckless, it often is; but often, too, it is seen in the devotion, the munificence, of Christian charity, and in the uprising of mighty masses of God-fearing men for the condemnation of what is wrong.

And this religious fervor of the masses of our people is as keenly sensitive in the matter of the education of our youth, and as sure to make its power felt there whenever it has reason to think a tendency is bad, as in any other department of life. It

was in a professor's family of a not distant university that I was asked: "And have you, too, heard that this is an irreligious institution?" And then I recalled the fact that attendance there had at one time fallen in point of numbers very unaccountably, and that investigation had shown the loss to be due to a want of confidence on the part of the people in the moral and religious relations of the university. Other institutions, the foremost in the country, again and again have felt themselves obliged to furnish the public with some positive evidence that with them the tendencies of undergraduate life were not immoral, and that their students were not left to flounder about helplessly in an atmosphere of intellectual skepticism.

It is just here, I think, that the American denominational college may assert its right to the confidence and the support of the American people, and may claim to be an institution of greater breadth, and of greater importance, than even the university or any of its branches, theological, medical, or legal. For in it alone of our higher institutions is the formation of character carried forward to maturity under the joint influence of intellectual and positive moral or religious training. Whether for young men or for young women, these colleges are pledged to the maintenance of traditional views of morality through the most solemn of all pledges, and that is the religious foundation on which they rest. There never has been any sure sanction for morality but religion. Disturb that, and men of the higher type will perchance seek for another in this or that philosophical system. From Socrates to Comte and Mr. Chas. H. Pearson they repeatedly have done so; but the sure proof that they have never succeeded is their want of agreement, and the unmistakable evidence that their systems after all are but shadows of the religion which they are attempting to supersede. He who advocates the power of a morality not based on religion may exclaim: "But there is no love for theology, no reverence for creeds in this generation," and he may be telling us the truth. But a decay in the power of dogma is no evidence whatever of a decay of religious life. It is of the very nature of humanity, as it runs its course of development through the ages, that it must repeatedly adapt itself to changing spiritual conditions. And it may be that the new thought now at work in the world—although it often exhibits great recklessness and want of wisdom—involves many a change in organized religious views. But, whatever may be in store for us in this particular, one thing, I think, is certain: In no institutions in our country is there at one

and the same time greater reverence for the system of morals which has hitherto made human progress possible, and a quicker perception of the signs of the times and readiness to accept their normal results than will be found in the denominational college. And this means much. The college, as distinct from the professional school, is the institution for the training of our sons and daughters, not for usefulness in this or that particular direction, but as men and women, whose intellectual discipline has in a normal way been kept in touch with the movements of the age in which their lives are cast, but whose moral character also has at the same time been developed and strengthened by the constant challenge to duty of a system of ethics which still rests on a religious foundation—the only sure foundation for a moral system.

For, however pure has been the home-life from which a boy goes to college, he usually leaves it when his character is still unformed, and the powers of his manhood but beginning to awaken. If the training of his home to a careful regard for what is right should not be followed by a system whose very office it is to help him to rise above himself and all the lower passions and appetites of self, there can be but one possible result. In the course of his mental training his spiritual perceptions will tend to grow dull, the supersensuous, the ideal, the divine, will gradually lose for him their former power of attraction, and he will sink to the level of a world which respects nothing but physical facts and material forces. The man will be engulfed in the irreligious maelstrom which is the final issue of a training where the subordinate relation of intellect to will is not acknowledged.

On the other hand, if his training at college supplements his home-life in the way I have intimated, he will enter upon his professional studies with a character fortified against the perils which await him, but at the same time trained freely to acknowledge and gladly to accept whatever of positive good the world's activity may achieve.

It is unnecessary to refer to instances. Rugby and the work of Dr. Arnold is known to every American boy; and there are many middle-aged men who, if they question their own hearts, will have to go back to the college chapel, whether at morning prayer or at Sunday service, for some of the most quickening impulses and the most enriching experiences of their lives. Even those who gave no sign at college that they ever felt the transforming power of this teaching, could not but approach their professional careers in an entirely different attitude from

that which is begotten of an education otherwise directed. Unconscious absorption, the influence of association, and the daily challenge to duty, as at the command of a loving Heavenly Father, are of immeasurable reach. Their fruits are gathered only in Heaven.

I cannot here so much as touch upon the divided condition of the Church, and the waste of financial resource which that involves for educational work; nor can I stop to point out or to deplore the ruinous antagonisms growing out of denominational differences. But, granting all that may be said in that connection, it still remains an undeniable truth that this divided, and so weakened, Church, has made our present progress possible. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that in every movement for the elevation and ennoblement of man through education it still stands first, toils hardest, and suffers most. Science may do much, the State may do much, humanitarian societies may do much—but all of them, singly or collectively, fall short of its achievement. It gives freely of that which it has, and rejoices to see the ingathering of fruits which are not of its sowing, but still are of its kind.

Now, if the men who are to mould the future, and to carry the problems of the present nearer to their final issue, are to have an equipment sufficient for their task, both intellectual and moral, I know of no place where it can be had except in the denominational college as supplementary to family life. Here character is formed under the best possible combination of influences, and so far developed and strengthened that there is good reason to believe the young graduate will raise whatever problems he may deal with in life to a higher level than that of material existence, and so be able to appreciate and interpret aright the anxious and even pathetic longings for a larger life which are so vaguely, but so surely and so strongly, at work in the masses of the people at the present time.

*Lancaster, Pa.*

## IX.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

"THINGS NEW AND OLD." Sermons by E. P. Herbruck, Pastor of Trinity Reformed Church, Canton, Ohio. Price, \$1.50.

The above work, as its title indicates, is a book of Sermons. We have read it, and found it interesting and profitable. It contains fifteen dissertations on quite a variety of topics. We had the pleasure, several years ago, of listening to some sermons delivered by the author of this book. He is a pleasant and forcible speaker. He is, without question, one of the finest orators in the Reformed Church. His sermons read well, too. There is no grandiloquence about him. His style, as a writer, is terse and clear. His sentences are short and simple. The reader has no difficulty whatever in apprehending the meaning of what he writes. The illustrations he uses to elucidate or enforce the truth presented are, as a rule, quite apt. "Things New and Old" is a very readable book.

The book contains a large amount and great variety of important practical truth. The author is conservative and takes a good common-sense view of nearly all the subjects that come under his treatment. There is very little said in the entire book with which we cannot agree; though he occasionally employs somewhat extravagant, or at least one-sided, expressions; as for example when he quotes with his endorsement (pp. 111 and 154) the statement of Montalembert that "without a Sabbath no worship, without worship no religion;" or when (p. 144) he expresses himself as follows: "I make the emphatic assertion that it is just as sacred a duty to cast a ballot and take an interest in legislation, as it is to praise God and pray to Him in His house." These expressions, and others of like character, may be open to question; though they serve a good purpose in calling attention to the great importance of the subject that the speaker has under consideration.

The author of these sermons is an optimist on the question of the future of Christianity (see first chapter, on "The Outlook of the World," and p. 185). No fault can be found with his hopefulness. Every preacher has the privilege of viewing the future of the present order of things as it may seem right to him. The teaching of the Scriptures, in its relation to the future, is not very decisive or clear. As a consequence, two general views are held in regard to the matter. Some learned men hold that the world will become

better from age to age until humanity is very generally permeated by the power of Christianity, and prepared for the second appearance of the Son of Man, to bring the entire process of human redemption to a final consummation. Others equally learned believe that humanity will in the future become more and more worldly, until the Church herself will become so filled with the spirit of the world that it may well be asked, "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith in the earth?" According to this view the powers of the Gospel will finally become exhausted, and the only hope for the elect will be the Advent of Christ with power and great glory.

Neither of these views may be correct. The things that will come to pass at the end of the world will no doubt wonderfully surprise the wisest among the children of God, though it is altogether likely that there is an element of truth in each of the above conceptions. The course things will take in the future may be midway between the extremes mentioned. But men may reason on this subject as they will, and hold the view most to their liking. This much is, however, indisputably true, that the optimistic spirit is a much more pleasant and agreeable one to entertain than the pessimistic. And, further, a review of the historical events and accomplishments of the century just closing must convince any one that marked progress has been made in the development of the good in man. Much more love, sympathy, and charity are exercised to-day than ever before. Slaves have been liberated, the condition of woman has been ameliorated, the horrors and cruelties of war have been much lessened, and international laws have been established on a basis of righteousness and justice. Might no longer makes right among the nations of the earth. There are many reasons why we should be hopeful. And yet we should not be unmindful of the fact that false principles and pernicious errors are no doubt germinating in the womb of the present, and that the future will have dangers to meet and risks to run. The admonition, therefore, to which every preacher of the gospel should give heed is, Watch, therefore!

The author of the book under consideration has a very high appreciation of the American nation. He glories in its past achievements and expects still greater things of it in the future. He believes that the Lord has a special care for the American people. "The Jews," he says, "were God's chosen people in ancient times; but we, of America, seem to be God's chosen people in modern times" (p. 143). On this fact he bases the admonition that his hearers shall realize their privileges and responsibilities, and conscientiously discharge their duties.

"Things New and Old" is worthy of a large circulation, especially among our Reformed people. There is, however, nothing denom-

inational in it, and it can be read with profit by Christians of every name.

Though we can honestly thus commend these sermons, yet in reading them we felt all along that there was, with all their excellencies, still something seriously lacking in them. We know full well that it is much easier to criticise sermons than to produce faultless ones. Still we feel constrained to point out in these what to us seems a fundamental defect. Dr Theo. L. Cuyler, as quoted several months ago by the *Messenger* from the *Christian at Work*, says: "A sermon is not a platform address; nor is it a lyceum lecture for popular instruction or entertainment. Preaching is the presentation of God's truth to men's souls, with the purpose of making bad people good, and good people better." Another writer says: "The descent is easy from preaching only half the Christ to eliminating Him from the sermon altogether; not His name, indeed, nor yet His moral teaching, but *Him*. True faith holds that Christ is the Head, and that the Church is His body; that He is wisdom, not simply the teacher of wisdom; that He is life, not simply the teacher of the way of life; and that He is the door to Heaven, and not simply the way-pointer. All this is ignored in the growing tendency to *teach Christianity without preaching Christ*."\* To us there seems to be in these sermons a great deal of preaching about Christianity and about Christ, without preaching Christianity and Christ in a direct, positive manner. They nearly all partake more of the nature of a "lyceum lecture" than of a gospel sermon. They are interesting in their contents, and no doubt attracted large congregations in their delivery. But the conception that Christianity is a real economy of divine life and grace on earth—a constitution of living forces at hand among men for their salvation—does not appear in any form or manner in this book. This, to our mind, is the weakness of these sermons, and of a host of others preached in these latter days.

When John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, came preaching in the wilderness, the burden of his sermons was, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And when Jesus, during His ministry sent the twelve forth on a missionary tour, He said unto them, "As ye go, preach, saying, *The kingdom of heaven is at hand*." The kingdom of heaven was at hand in the person of Christ. In Him were present on earth heavenly life and powers, which also manifested themselves in His words and works. In his teaching and preaching, Christ did not direct men to look up to heaven so much as to Himself, in whom were to be found love, mercy, forgiveness and judgment. "I am the way, the truth and the life."

\* Rev. J. G. Noss, in this Review, Vol. 16, p. 218.

But Christ was crucified, ascended to heaven, and is seated at the right hand of God. Where is the kingdom of heaven now? Has it departed from the earth? No, surely not. The Saviour's declarations of promise were: "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come unto you;" "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever;" "Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth." "He shall glorify me, for He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." This other Comforter, Christ says, is the Spirit of truth, which is the Holy Ghost. To the commission which Christ gave the apostles to preach the gospel, He adds the promise, "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

The abiding presence of the Holy Ghost, and the ever-continuing presence of Christ through the mediation of the Spirit, represent the kingdom of heaven on earth, under the present dispensation. But the presence of the Holy Ghost and of Christ is associated with believers and the gospel. Believers and the gospel, by the guidance of the Spirit of truth, have assumed an organized form under the constitution of the Church. The Church is called the body of Christ: "We, being many, are one body in Christ;" "Ye are the body of Christ;" "And He is the Head of the body, the Church;" "And gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." From what the Scriptures say of the Holy Ghost and of the Church, and Christ's relation to the Church, we must believe that the kingdom of heaven is still present and operative in the world.

The burden of the preaching must consequently evermore be the same that it was in the beginning, namely, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Powers of heaven are present in the earth through the Holy Ghost, by the Gospel, in the Church. We care not how the presence of the heavenly kingdom be described, just so its presence be realized and asserted by the preacher. We would say that the Church with her divine word, holy sacraments, ordained ministry, and body of believers represents the kingdom of heaven in the world, and that the powers of Christ through the operation of the Holy Spirit are evermore present in the Church for the salvation of the world. If the book under review contained one sermon on the Church as the body of Christ, or on Christianity as a real living constitution in the world embodying in itself powers from heaven, or better yet, if underlying and pervading all the dissertation there were a conception and felt sense of the presence of the kingdom of heaven with its regenerating and saving powers, this book of sermons would be vastly improved, for it would then, as we believe, be more in harmony with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles.

We have written this much on this subject because we believe it well that the attention of preachers be called to the matter. But notwithstanding the above criticism, we can conscientiously commend "Things New and Old" to the ministry and laity of the Church as profitable reading.

A. E. T.

**INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.** By Emanuel V. Gerhart, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa. Vol. II. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, London and Toronto, 1894. Price, \$3.00.

It is a matter of congratulation that the author of this work has been spared to give to the Reformed Church this rich result of her theological activity during a period of half a century. Among the numerous productions of her learned professors this work takes its place among the greatest and best, and is a monument of the venerable author's earnest study and labor. He has enjoyed rare opportunity for the production of his work. He has taken a prominent part in the theological activity of the leading scholars of the Church from the time of Rauch, has labored as contemporary with Nevin, Schaff, and other eminent theologians, and concluded his work in the calm that has succeeded the controversial period in the Church with the ripened powers of a long life of faithful study. His work takes an honorable place among the leading productions of the age in theology, and reflects credit upon the Church it represents. Along with its general ability, its peculiar merit consists in applying what has come to be known as the Christological principle to a complete system of Dogmatics which has distinguished the theological thinking of the Reformed Church in the United States for the last half century. In this respect it is in advance of the able and learned works in theology that have appeared in this country from the time of Jonathan Edwards to the present time.

A most pertinent example of the application of this principle appears in the opening chapters of this second volume on "Anthropology, or Doctrine on the Adamic Race." That the key to unlock the mystery of man, his status, character and destiny, should be found in the archetypal person of the God-man, Jesus Christ, is a rare conception in theology. The usual view has been that man had an independent origin and development, and that Christ came as an after-thought on the part of God merely to rectify the ruin of the fall, whereas here the God-man appears as the absolute revelation of God and the archetype of man. As the creation of man, though last in the order of the world's existence, illumines all that went before in the world's historic evolution, so the Incarnation of the eternal Logos determined ideally and finally made real the position of man in the order of creation. Whilst on the nature side, and in a certain sense, the evolution of man may be traced from the primeval protoplasm, yet in his spiritual nature he is modeled after

the God-man and finds his true destiny in and through Him. Hence very rich as well as rare are the opening chapters in this work on "The Divine Idea of Man," "Man studied in the Light of the Ideal Man," "Genesis by itself Inadequate," etc. Whilst scientists have delved in the darkness of the original matter of the world to find man's origin according to a Darwinian or Pantheistic hypothesis, and theologians labored to interpret the symbolism of the book of Genesis for the same purpose, a new light is here turned upon the subject from the archetypal God-man. As all things were made by the Logos, so in Him was life, and the life was the light of the world. The genesis of human reason and human will comes from the light of the Logos, who in His incarnate life realized the true ideal of man.

Of course the work grows in depth and interest as it moves on to the chapters on "Christology, or Doctrine on Jesus Christ," and the mysteries of Pneumatology, Eschatology, etc.; but we selected those on Anthropology as most pertinently illustrating the Christological principle.

Claiming, as we do, as having belonged to the Reformed Church, the renowned and now departed church historian, Dr. Schaff, we may now point with great gratitude and laudable pride to these two great contributions to our theological literature, Dr. Schaff's Church History, and Dr. Gerhart's Systematic Theology, besides other less organized and complete theological and philosophic literature, as fittingly representing the industry, talent, and originality of celebrated scholars in the Reformed Church before the Christian world. Beginning with the earliest numbers of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW, our Church has produced a Christian literature which may justly rank among the foremost and best of this age and of this country, yea of the world, truly a rich and rare inheritance for the new century soon to dawn upon us.

**THE THIRD WORLD COUNCIL;** that is, the Third Council of the Whole Christian World, East and West, which was held A. D. 431 at Ephesus, in Asia. Vol. I., which contains all of Act I. Translated by James Chrystal, M.A. James Chrystal, Publisher, 255 Grove Street, Jersey City, New Jersey, U. S. A. 1895. Sold to subscribers at \$3 a volume; to others at \$4.

This volume forms part of a work entitled "Authoritative Christianity," in which the author proposes to give in full a translation into English of the Six Ecumenical Councils, "the sole utterances of the Whole Church before its division into East and West in the ninth century." Those Six Councils are: I. Nicæa, A. D. 325; II. First Constantinople, A. D. 381; III. Ephesus, A. D. 431; IV. Chalcedon, A. D. 451; V. Second Constantinople, A. D. 553; VI. Third Constantinople, A. D. 680. Of the work, the volume before us and Vol. I. of the First Ecumenical Council, held at Nicæa A. D. 325, are all that have as yet been published.

Act I. of the Third Ecumenical Council, held at Ephesus in A. D.

431, of which we have a translation in the present volume, "embraces the condemnation of Nestorius, the heresiarch, for his denial of the Incarnation, and for what St. Cyril calls his worship of a man (*Ἀνθρωπολατρεία*), and for what he terms his Cannibalism (*Ἀνθρωποφάγια*) on the Eucharist, and for his errors therein specified." Besides the translation of this Act, the volume, which is a large octavo of over 850 pages, contains a number of introductory papers, which the author designates "forematter," and copious notes and comments on the text of the translation. The work is one which will interest all those who desire to acquaint themselves fully with the acts and proceedings of the early Christian Councils.

A HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH, DUTCH; THE REFORMED CHURCH, GERMAN; AND THE MORAVIAN CHURCH, IN THE UNITED STATES. By E. T. Corwin, D.D.; Professor J. H. Dubbs, D.D.; and Professor J. T. Hamilton. New York: The Christian Literature Co. 1895. Price, \$3.00.

The American Church History Series, consisting of a series of denominational histories, published under the auspices of the American Society of Church History, promises, when completed, to be a very full and valuable history of Christianity in the United States of North America. Of the series eight volumes have now appeared, and four still remain to be published. All the volumes which have as yet been given to the public are of a high order of excellence, and will abundantly repay study. The last volume issued is the one now before us, and it is equal in merit to any of those that have preceded it. In it we have, indeed, very interesting and instructive sketches of the history of the churches to which it relates. The history of the Reformed Church in the United States, by Professor J. H. Dubbs, D.D., will be found especially satisfactory and attractive, and it will, no doubt, prove valuable in giving the general public a better knowledge of the character and mission of this branch of the American Church. The volume is one which should find a place in every Reformed family in our country. A careful study of it can scarcely fail to be productive of good results. The work is published in excellent style, and will, in every way, prove an ornament to any library in which it may find a place, be it that of minister or layman.

TRAVELS IN THREE CONTINENTS—EUROPE, AFRICA, ASIA. By J. M. Buckley, LL.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Craunton & Curtis, 1895. Price, \$3.50.

In the latter part of the year 1888 and the earlier part of 1889, Dr. Buckley traveled through portions of Europe, Africa, and Asia. He visited more especially Spain, Morocco, Algeria, Italy, Egypt, the Holy Land, Syria, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Greece, Turkey, Eastern Roumelia, Bulgaria, Servia and Hungary. In the volume whose title is given above, which is an attractive octavo of 632

pages, printed on fine paper in large, clear type, and embellished by eighty-five illustrations, nearly all of which are full page, he tells us how he was impressed by what he saw and heard, and in addition gives such other information as is necessary to the interpretation of his impressions. His object in giving this account of his travels, he states in the preface of the work, is a desire to aid those who contemplate this journey to prepare for it; to refresh the recollection of those who have preceded him; and to make those who do not expect to cross the ocean to see, while looking through his eyes, almost as well as with their own. As Dr. Buckley is a very well informed man, a keen observer, and ready writer, his book is not only highly instructive, but also exceedingly interesting. It can therefore be read with much pleasure and profit. We commend it to all who are interested in those portions of the globe which he visited, and who take pleasure in seeing foreign countries through the eyes of another.

**POPULAR SCIENTIFIC LECTURES.** By Ernest Mack, Professor of Physics in the University of Prague. Translated by Thomas J. McCormack. With forty-four cuts and diagrams. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1895. Price, \$1.00.

Twelve scientific lectures by one of the foremost scientific men of the age make up the contents of this volume. Of these lectures, eight are of a popular character, and four of a philosophical nature. The subjects of which they respectively treat are: the Forms of Liquids, the Fibres of Corti, the Causes of Harmony, the Velocity of Light, Why has Man Two Eyes? Symmetry, the Fundamental Concepts of Static Electricity, the Principle of the Conservation of Energy, the Economical Nature of Physical Inquiry, Transformation and Adaptation in Scientific Thought, the Principle of Comparison in Physics, and the Relative Educational Value of the Classics and Mathematico-Physical Sciences. All the lectures are noteworthy on account of their simplicity and frankness of statement, and their beauty of style. They not only convey much useful and interesting information, but also embody "the elements that constitute the essential poetry of research." Owing to their superior character they are admirably designed to awaken enthusiasm in scientific investigations, as well as to impart instruction. The book is therefore one which will amply repay careful study.